

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
October 22, 2010 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

1. Hon. Betty Ann Kane	Chairman
2. Henry Hultquist	AT&T Inc.
3. Jeffrey S. Lanning	CenturyLink
4. Cindy Sheehan	Comcast Corporation
5. Karen Reidy	CompTel
6. Suzanne Howard	Cox Communications, Inc.
7. Matthew Gerst	CTIA – The Wireless Association
8. David Greenhaus	800 Response Information Services
9. Gregory Diamond	Level 3 Communications, LLC
10. Hon. Geoffrey G. Why	NARUC - Massachusetts
11. Don Gray	NARUC – Nebraska
12. Joel Cheskis	NASUCA
13. William Vallée	NASUCA
14. Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
15. John McHugh	OPASTCO
16. Mary Retka	Qwest
17. Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
18. Natalie McNamer	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
19. Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
20. Kevin Green	Verizon
21. Brendan Kasper	Vonage
22. Tiki Gaugler	XO Communications

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA
Garth Steele	Welch & Company
Bill Mason	CRTC

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Michelle Sclater, Alternate DFO, Competition Policy Division
Sanford Williams, Competition Policy Division
Gary Remondino, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 30 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – May 21, 2010
- (3) Billing and Collection Agent Report
- (4) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (5) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (6) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report to the NANC
- (7) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (7a) Guide to Porting a Telephone Number
- (8) North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
- (9) Dispute Resolution Team Report – Findings and Recommendations
- (9a) Joint Comments on the NANC Telcordia Dispute Resolution Interim Report
- (10) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (11) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	5
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from May 21, 2010	6

3.	Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	7
4.	Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	13
5.	Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	15
6.	Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	24
7.	Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	32
8.	North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	52
9.	Report of the Telcordia Dispute Resolution Team: Telcordia Appeal	67
10.	Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	88
11.	Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	91
12.	Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	110
13.	Summary of Action Items	--
14.	Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	--
15.	Other Business	--

IV. Summary of the Meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good morning. We are going to call to order the meeting of the North American Numbering Council. For the record it is Friday, October 22, 2010. It is 9:42 a.m., and we are in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W. in Washington, D.C. I'm Betty Ann Kane, Chairman of the Council.

The first item on our agenda is Announcements and Recent News. However,

for the record before we get to that, I want to ask us to go around the room and just for the record indicate your presence, name, and affiliation.

Hank Hultquist:	AT&T
Jeffrey Lanning:	CenturyLink
Cindy Sheehan:	Comcast
Suzanne Howard:	Cox
Matt Gerst:	CTIA
Greg Diamond:	Level 3
Don Gray:	Nebraska Public Service Commission
Jerome Candelaria:	NCTA
John McHugh:	OPASTCO
Mary Retka:	Qwest
Rosemary Emmer:	Sprint Nextel
Natalie McNamer:	T-Mobile
Tom Soroka:	US Telecom
Kevin Green:	Verizon
Brendan Kasper:	Vonage
Marilyn Jones:	FCC

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. We do have a bridge open for members of the Council to participate by phone. Is there anyone on the bridge?

Bill Wineman:	Washington Commission
William Vallée:	NASUCA

Geoffrey Why: Massachusetts

David Greenhaus: 800 Response

Linda Hyman: NeuStar Pooling

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm sorry we didn't get that last one. I started to talk before you said it. Introduce yourself again.

Steve Haddocks: NeuStar NPAC

Joel Cheskis: Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocates

Jay Carpenter: The 1-800 American Pre-trade Association, 1-800 AFTA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good, very large participation by phone. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

In terms of announcements, first of all we do have three new members who have been officially appointed. The first one who is with us today, welcome Greg Diamond from Level 3.

And also we have on the phone as he introduced himself, Joel Cheskis who is a representative from NASUCA, the National Association of Consumer Advocates. He is from the Pennsylvania office of Consumer Advocate.

And I mentioned that Greg is from Level 3. And also Suzanne Howard, Director of Regulatory Policy for Cox Communications has also been appointed officially to the Council. So we welcome them all and look forward to your working with us.

Are there any other announcements or recent news Marilyn that need to be shared?

MS. JONES: Rosemary would like to share something.

MS. EMMER: The kids aren't here yet.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary Emmer has some guests who will be joining us, and when they do arrive we'll let you introduce them. Thank you.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

All right, then the next item on the agenda is the approval of the transcript of our last meeting which was on May 21, 2010. That was emailed out and you also have a hard copy before you. Are there any additions or corrections to this transcript? I'll give you a couple of minutes to read it.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies. I'll just email it, but there was one unidentified speaker on page 42, and it was our attorney John Nakahata from Wiltshire Grannis, counsel to Telcordia.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. And I'll remind you when you do speak, introduce yourself and wait a couple seconds because I believe the man has to actually turn on the microphone system. We don't have buttons here to turn them on and off so when you start speaking right away it's not going to pick your first couple of words. And also speak right into the microphone.

And I'll also remind you if you do have pagers, BlackBerrys, phones, put them on silent or vibrate please. Thank you.

Are there any other additions or corrections to the transcript? All right then I'll look for a motion to approve the transcript of the May 21, 2010 meeting.

MR. GRAY: So moved.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Moved by Don Gray, seconded by AT&T. All in favor?

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I assume there's no opposition. All right, that is done.

Next on our agenda, we have the report from the North American Numbering Plan, Billing and Collection Agent and that will be presented. Will the presenter come forward?

We need to number the documents. Approval of the transcript will be document number one and the report from the agent will be document number two. Now you can go ahead.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN BILLING
AND COLLECTION AGENT (NANP B&C AGENT)**

MR. STEELE: Good morning. My name is Garth Steele. I'm a partner with Welch LLP, and I'm here representing the Billing and Collection Agent this morning.

And we have for you a financial update for the North American Numbering Plan Fund as of September 30th, and on the first page of that report we have the statement of financial position which summarizes the assets and liabilities of the

Fund, and if we subtract the liabilities from the assets we end up with the Fund balance.

And you can see from that report that the Fund balance at the end of September is \$2,847,000 and that's made up of cash in the bank of \$2.9 million, accounts receivable of \$245,000, some prepaid expenses of \$64,000 for total assets of \$3.2 million and from that we subtract the liabilities that exist at the end of September of \$389,000 to end up with a Fund balance of \$2.8 million at the end of September. Near the bottom of that first page is a makeup of the liabilities as they exist at the end of September.

Flipping the page over to the second page of the report which is a wide spreadsheet, the first three columns in the spreadsheet provide the actual revenues and expenses for the first three months of the Fund year and the Fund runs from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011. So the first three columns provide actual figures for the year to date and the remaining columns provide our projection as to where the Fund will be by the end of June.

If you look to the column marked total which is about two thirds of the way across the page, you'll see where we expect to be by the end of June 2011, and if you go to the bottom of that column, the bottom three numbers show that we expect the Fund balance at the end of June 2011 to be \$475,000. That's our most recent projection.

When we entered into the budgeting process we budgeted for the Fund balance to be about \$500,000 which means that the projection at this point although

we're still relatively early in the year is that we're going to come in pretty much on budget at close to the \$500,000 mark left in the Fund by the end of this funding year which is June 30, 2011.

So what we can tell from that, and again it's relatively early in the year, only three months in out of the 12, is that at this point there are no major surprises as to additional expenses that will be incurred by the Fund or there is no unexpected negative surprises with respect to the amount of revenue that we will collect.

For your information there's a box in the bottom right hand corner that explains in some detail the difference between the projected Fund balance of \$500,000 and the anticipated Fund balance as of today's date for June 30th which we again project to be \$475,000.

So some expenses are slightly higher than expected, some revenues are slightly higher than expected but overall we expect the Fund to come in pretty close to target.

Flipping the page then, once again we have page four which provides some significant details with respect to each one of the contracts that are in place for various expenditures to be paid for by the North American Numbering Plan Fund.

And in the left hand side of the page we give you an update as to which months invoices have received approval for payment by the FCC and have been paid and the remaining columns project what each one of the contract payments will be for each of the next six months. This is detailed information that is provided for your information but it has been summarized on the previous page and has been built into

the budget.

And the final page of the report, page five is titled Deliverables Report and it just gives you an update or where we're at as the North American Plan Fund Administrators with respect to our monthly processing issues. And really nothing out of the ordinary here to report. We're up-to-date with respect to sending invoices to carriers. We're up-to-date with respect to collecting payments.

We monitor the FCC Red Light Report each month prior to refunding any money to carriers. We respond to complaints or queries from carriers and other contributors to the Fund on a timely basis.

We have no new staffing changes at our administration to report. We're working under a temporary contract extension that runs to the end of January 31, 2011, and accounts receivables are in good shape and we're getting some timely feedback from the FCC with respect to write-offs of bad debts and/or receipt of money that the FCC has collected on debts that are outstanding over 90 days.

So that's a quick tour through the financial statements for the North American Numbering Plan Fund at the end of September 30th, with highlights being that the Fund balance at the end of September was \$2.8 million. We had budgeted for the Fund to wind its way down to \$500,000 by the end of June and at this point it looks like we're going to be very close to that figure.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? I have two questions just for information. The contract, you said your contract expired October 1st of last year. Just for my information, who is doing the contracting

process? Is that an FCC contract?

MR. STEELE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And is there any reason why it has gone so long without being redone?

MR. STEELE: I guess the FCC would have to answer that question.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. And the accounts receivable, if I read the numbers which are on the previous page, you have essentially bad debts not budgeted for. A decrease in the amount of bad debt, is that correct, about \$30,000? I'm looking at the little box at the bottom right hand corner.

MR. STEELE: We do not budget for bad debt expense. There were bad debts in the first three months of the year of \$30,000, and those bad debts can usually be absorbed by the \$500,000 cushion that's left in the Fund.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And so those are bad debts that have been written off?

MR. STEELE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That have gotten that process, okay, thank you. Are there any other questions?

MR. GOYETTE: David GOYETTE from New Hampshire. Is there a link for which I could access reports that are being discussed today?

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm sorry, who is asking?

MR. GOYETTE: I'm David Goyette from New Hampshire, the New Hampshire PUC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The materials were sent out by email to all the

members of the Council.

MR. GOYETTE: I see, okay.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So if you're on that list you would have gotten it by email. Thank you. Don Gray.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. On page four of the spreadsheet up at the top there you have payment authorized by the FCC under NeuStar NANP Administrator and the August payment appears to be a little too big for the cell size so we've got a bunch of pound signs there. Do you have what that figure was?

MR. STEELE: I'm sorry, the copy that I have does have the figures on it. I'm sorry about that. So you're reading under the first heading which is NeuStar NANPA administration contract, is that correct?

MR. GRAY: NeuStar NAP administration right, the August payment -- well, the September payment is listed as \$130,041.

MR. STEELE: And just to the cell over and the cell up from that, the August 2010 payment should read \$130,353. I apologize for that.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any other questions? We will accept that report and that is item number three.

Moving to number four on our agenda, report of the Billing and Collection Working Group and Rosemary, you're going to do that.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP

MS. EMMER: Thank you, Garth, for providing those fine details of our budget.

My name is Rosemary Emmer for those of you that don't know me, and I chair the Billing and Collection Working Group along with Tim Decker with Verizon who is behind me. The Billing and Collection Working Group is responsible for the oversight of the functional requirements of the Billing and Collection Agent and we are gearing up right now to do our yearly performance evaluation.

Page four shows our contribution factor and all the Fund history. Page five lists our meeting schedule for next year, and page six, our membership is currently AT&T, Bell Canada, CTIA, Cox, Comcast, Sprint Nextel, Qwest, Verizon, 800 Response.

We encourage participation. Our next two meetings are listed on the last page so we would welcome new participants. Tim Decker's and my email address is on the last page so if you have any questions before you join our next call feel free to email. If you have any questions about the report let us know. That's it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much, Rosemary. Are there any questions about the report? Thank you. And I understand your guests are here. Would you like to introduce them?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I've been mentoring some middle school and high school age kids that are here with us today. They

wanted to come see what it is all about to be at the NANC meeting.

They've been learning about numbering related issues which is really great especially seeing as though I keep hearing people say at lunches and dinners that they're thinking of retiring.

(LAUGHTER)

So it doesn't seem like we can go through a breakfast, lunch, or dinner anymore without at least having that conversation once and so there is new blood coming up, potentially is here. No pressure kids.

(LAUGHTER)

They are a Maryland Life Smarts Team. They were the 2010 National Life Smarts Champions. And if you'll put your hands up when I call your name, Maura Taylor, Aidan Taylor, Nick Martin, Cobey England, and Ms. Judy England is their mentor. So did I get everyone? Did I get the names right? Everything's good, okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Thank you young people for coming, and it's always nice to see the next generation and members of the Numbering Council.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. EMMER: There is actually one person that I don't recognize. I don't know her name, and I'd like to put her name on the record.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Certainly.

MS. EMMER: Shayla Keating. I'll get the right spelling of her name.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. We hope you find this interesting and instructive.

Now we're up to item five on our agenda and that is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator. This will be document number 5. John Manning.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN
ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)**

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. This is John Manning, Director of the North American Numbering Plan Administration Group.

Just one item kind of going back. Some folks on the bridge were asking about some of the documents that we're looking at this morning.

Some of these documents have already been posted to the NANC chair website. I'm working this morning to get the remaining reports that came out on Wednesday to be posted hopefully during the meeting today so folks on the bridge will be able to get access to them. The website is www.nanc-chair.org and when they are posted I will let the Chair know and she can announce it assuming we're still here in the meeting.

The NANPA report consists of generally the same type of information I typically provide. I'm going to look at the status of all of the NANPA resources, take a look at area cover relief planning, and then a few other items to make the NANC aware of, and of course if you have any questions, --

I do have one more item and I'll make an announcement at the end of my presentation concerning some changes at Neustar management.

Beginning on page two of the report, summarize area codes. Since the beginning of this year the NANPA has assigned six area codes. I have listed them for you in the report. Over the same time period we've seen seven area codes go into service, the most recent of which was the NPA 855 for toll free services which was just this month and we've also reserved one area code for relief of the Jamaican NPA.

With regard to central office codes, from January through September of this year, NANPA has assigned 2,133 codes. Over that same time period 244 codes have been returned.

The chart in the middle of the presentation gives you a look at 2006 through 2009 compared to an annualized figure for 2010. You'll see in the neighborhood of approximately 2800 codes are expected for 2010 and how that compares with the previous year.

Also in terms of returns and reclamations, we're looking at approximately 300 returns for 2010, which I should note you can see that's a fairly significant reduction from what we've experienced over the past four years.

I would note it is not necessarily surprising with the widespread implementation of number pooling and of course portability. A number of these codes that would be returned either have blocks assigned to other carriers or numbers ported out of them and thus, they are reassigned to another carrier.

Net assignments are projected to be about 2500 codes for 2010, which, when you look at the chart, other than 2006, it looks to be one of the higher years that we've had over the past four years or so.

Feature Group B, Carrier Identification Codes, we've only assigned one code this year and five have been reclaimed.

On the Feature Group D, Carrier Identification Codes, we've assigned 40 codes this year. We've also reclaimed 46 codes for the year.

Turning to page three, the 5YY resource, this is used for personal communication services. From January 1 through September 30 of this year we have assigned 505 5YY NXX codes. There have been no codes returned over that same time period.

As of September 30th, there were 189 codes available for assignment. To bring you up to date, as of today there's actually 170 5YY NXX codes available due to assignments we made over the past couple of weeks.

Recent activity along with updated forecasts from the service provider industry indicates that the 5YY resource will exhaust in the fourth quarter of this year and, per Industry Numbering Committee agreement, the 544 area code will be used as the next 5YY NPA. Resources from the 544 NPA will not be assigned until all resources out of the 500 and 533 NPAs have been exhausted.

The 900 area codes, no new assignments in 2010 and no codes returned, and you can see the quantity of available codes for that particular resource.

With regard to the 555 line numbers, there have been 24 assignments this

year. No assignments have been reclaimed.

For 800 855 resources which are used for the purpose of accessing public services on the PSTN intended for the deaf, hard of hearing, or speech impaired, eighteen, 800 855 line numbers have been assigned through September 30, 2010. Just to make note, we haven't made assignments out of this resource for quite some time until this year.

Vertical Service Codes, earlier this year we did assign one VSC, the *09 code. And for the area code 456 for international inbound services automatic number identification , ANI digit pairs and N11 codes, there have been no assignments in 2010.

Any questions with regard to the status of these resources?

Okay, proceeding to page four, Area Code Relief planning, understand that when we're looking at area codes projected to exhaust in the next 36 months. We are looking at those projections as of April 2010. NANPA will be reporting on the October 2010 area code and NANP exhaust projections which are expected to be available next week.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So we will have those for the December meeting?

MR. MANNING: Yes. A notice will be sent when they are posted to the website and I say that because some information you see here most likely will be changing, in particular the first two area codes you see here in Nebraska 402 and the Pennsylvania 570. But with regard to those two, Nebraska 402, the new area code will be 531. Permissive dialing has already started. Mandatory dialing is expected

on February 26, 2011.

On August 31st, the PSC issued a letter stating that NANPA is not to assign codes from the 531 area code until the level of remaining 402 NPA codes reaches ten.

With regard to the Pennsylvania 570, the decision was made to overlay that particular NPA with the 272 area code. When the PUC determines that the 570 NPA is within three months of exhaust it will notify the industry to begin customer education and permissive seven and ten digit dialing. Note all network preparations are to be completed no later than March 1, 2011.

With regard to some of the other activity, you have seen these before, Oklahoma 918, they've already initiated permissive seven and ten digit dialing, mandatory dialing, starting on March 5, 2011. The New York 718 and 347, that's existing overlay, they'll introduce the 929 NPA. Network preparations and customer education started in July and ought to be completed by March of 2011.

In Wisconsin we've have not initiated permissive seven digit and ten digit dialing. That will be in May of 2011. Mandatory dialing starts in February of 2012.

Arkansas 870 is out there a good little ways but they will be doing an overlay.

Recently Kentucky, in August, the Public Service Commission issued an order that suspended the January 1 2012 permissive dialing for the 270/364 NPA split. Mandatory dialing date remains open until further order of the PSC.

For the remaining items on the report, NANPA change orders, there's

actually two outstanding change orders. Change Order 18, this is the change order that will have NANPA begin the process of checking NRUF data to ensure carriers are reporting not only on codes assigned but also on blocks assigned. This change order is scheduled for deployment on November 19, 2010.

And just recently, NANPA submitted Change Order 19 which would incorporate the payment of an annual cost associated with hosting an online survey developed by the NOWG to solicit industry input on both NANPA and Pooling performance in 2010. That change order was just approved yesterday by the FCC.

Further news, on page five, just to let you know that NANPA has updated the NANP Administration System database servers on October 2nd. Those servers replaced servers that were purchased in August of 2003.

Our third quarter NANPA newsletter came out earlier this month, and I've already mentioned about the October 2010 NPA NANP exhaust projections coming out later this month.

The remaining report talks about the status of NPAs exhausting in 36 months. Again I note these are based upon April 2010 projections. The report will be updated when we come back together in December with the October 2010 NPA exhaust projections.

That concludes my report. Let me just make one announcement and then I'll take any questions. This is a letter or information I should say we will be provided to the NANC.

This is a notice of change in the Chief Executive Officer position at NeuStar.

Lisa Hook, President of NeuStar has been elected by the NeuStar Board of Directors to serve as the new CEO in addition to her current position as president. Ms. Hook succeeds Jeff Ganek, founding CEO of the company. Mr. Ganek will remain Chairman of the Board.

This change was effective October 15th and it's a culmination of a three year succession plan. Prior to her election of CEO Ms. Hook served as president and Chief Operating Office of NeuStar for three years. The election of Ms. Hook to the CEO position is fully consistent with the FCC's neutrality rules and orders.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. Looking at the comparison chart on page two, and you highlighted that the net assignments for 2010 are higher than they've been for the last three or so years. Does the data give you any sense of what's driving the additional net assignments?

MR. MANNING: Well, the answer to your question is first of all we have seen an increase in the general assignments of central office codes. For a variety of instances, there may be new providers coming on board and establishing footprint. Many of the requests are in pooling areas but the result is they needed codes to supply or augment the pools.

I think the more interesting factor here is the assignment rate is on about par with what we experienced in 2007 and 2008. The difference here is the return of codes, that's significantly down, and simple math tells you that that's going to mean that the overall net assignments are going to be up.

When we've conducted the NPA and NANP exhaust projections, one of the things we continually stated over the years is that it is expected that at some point in time the number of returns will be significantly less than what we've been experiencing with the widespread implementation of pooling.

I think we're now beginning to see the impact of that in the sense that there may be carriers who wish to return resources but those resources have numbers assigned out of them and thus that code needs to be reassigned to another carrier so nobody goes out of service.

It will be interesting to see as we move through 2011, if we continue to see those net assignments stay where they are and of course the returns. The expectations are the returns will stay down.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions?

MALE SPEAKER: This is (Unintelligible) New Hampshire. Along that same line, are many of the assignments of codes related to providing LRNs to carriers?

MR. MANNING: Yes, we are seeing -- and of course you can get a code for three primary reasons, one of which is pool replenishment, one may need the requirement for an LRN, and of course there may be a dedicated customer request.

Yes, we've seen those requests and I won't put Amy Putnam the Pooling Administrator on the spot but I know they keep track of specific assignments as to whether or not they are one of those three categories. She has that information and she will be able to provide it to you in just a moment in terms of those assignments

rates for those three categories.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, maybe later. I'm curious if there are many assignments being made because of LRNs. I'm interested to know why carriers who may already have an LRN are requesting additional LRNs but that can wait until later. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We'll look at that question when that report is given. I do know, and I don't know if everyone on the phone has a copy of this particular report, but since you are from New Hampshire, note that the 603 area code in New Hampshire which I think is statewide --

MALE SPEAKER: That's right.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Is projected to exhaust in the third quarter 2012, and I see that a petition was re-filed with the New Hampshire Commission in August of this year.

MALE SPEAKER: That's right.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions?

MALE SPEAKER: If you're interested to know, an order of notice regarding a hearing on that petition went out and the hearing begins on the 27th of October.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good, thank you for updating that. And that report will be accepted if there are no further questions.

Now we had on the agenda, after that report we were going to take a break. I think we're a little bit ahead of schedule. We're going to take a break at 10:30 a.m.

So let's go on to item number six which is the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS-BLOCK POOLING

ADMINISTRATOR (PA)

MS. PUTNAM: Good morning. My name is Amy Putnam. I'm the Director of Thousands-Block Pooling and pooling is fine.

You have in front of you I hope the report of the Pooling Administrator and it indicates a rolling 12 month cycle of data. The first couple of sheets are the pooling administration activity broken down by part threes in a variety of ways so that you can see the total applications per month for the last 12 months.

The year-to-date we have 77,405 part threes that we have processed. In 2009 at this time we had processed 68,910 so we are definitely ahead of 2009 at this point.

And I will let you look through those charts at your convenience, or as I think I've indicated before some night when you're having trouble falling asleep.

On page three in the center of the page there is a small chart that indicates central office codes that have been opened in the last 12 months and you will see that we've opened 763 for LRNs, 159 for dedicated customers, and 1766 for pool replenishment.

The next chart is the summary of rate center file changes. These are changes to the status of rate centers either from excluded to optional, from mandatory single service provider to mandatory because the second service provider has come in or if they're SIM driven, supplemental implementation meeting driven, they would

change from optional to mandatory and you can see the number of changes each month and the number of affected states.

Next page, our reclamation summary, we show the total number of blocks each month that have an overdue part four and the total number of new blocks on the list each month. So just looking at September as an example, 162 new blocks showed up on the reclamation list that month, 304 blocks would have carried over from previous months making it a total of 466 blocks on the overdue Part Four list for the month of September. And then we see in the far right hand column the number of blocks that are authorized to be reclaimed and those authorizations come from the states or from the FCC.

The next chart shows the Pooling Administration system performance from October 2009 to September 2010. We did have one instance of unavailability in August during a routine maintenance event where we failed over and we discovered the outage, put in the trouble ticket and resolved it within a few minutes on Friday evening, August 13th, and had no complaints from customers.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Friday, the 13th.

MS. PUTNAM: Friday the 13th, yes. With hindsight probably a bad day to choose.

Okay, other pooling related activities, August 14th every year is our contract anniversary and on August 14th of this year the FCC renewed our contract for another year, exercised its option to renew the contract for another year of the five year cycle. The contract runs from 2007 to 2012 and beyond.

The next chart, contract reporting, shows all of our requirements and the reports that have been submitted.

Regulatory, a couple of years ago the FCC or this body, asked us to include regularly the information on the delegated authority petitions and you have a chart there showing the delegated authority petitions.

The FCC issued an order in May granting authority to four states to implement additional mandatory pooling. Pennsylvania issued its order in June and implemented in two phases, 60 rate centers on August 30th changed designations and 198 rate centers changed designation on September 30th.

Indiana notified us of their order on October 5th and the supplemental implementation meeting will be held in Indiana on November 3rd.

Alaska put its intent to implement pooling out for comment on August 27th. No comments were filed and we are advised that staff is working on an order to implement pooling and we are also advised that Mississippi is working on its order.

In the last 12 months we had 697 requests for ESQKs under our authority as the interim routing number authority. We approved 684 and denied 13. We received 14 ESQK registrations, approved 8 and denied 6.

As you can see, we continue to participate in the meetings with the NOWG. We conducted a website preview for the NOWG members on September 30th, and I'll talk about that a little bit more in a bit.

We had a lot of change order activity. Change orders 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 were all impacted in the past few months. We had implantation of several of

them.

We submitted change order 17 on October 13th and that's related to developing an additional all blocks report which will be called All Blocks Augmented which has additional fields on it. And that was approved yesterday and that report was developed in conjunction with NANPA change order 18 that is requiring additional NRUF reporting, for more detailed NRUF reporting I should say.

And then you have another table showing the status of all the change orders. Again you have seen that before. We keep that on there so that you have a historical chart, again for those dull evenings.

All change orders are posted on our website so anytime you want to look at one feel free.

Looking at special projects, the very old overdue part four reconciliation process, you may remember we started this going back to overdue part fours that predated January 2007, and then we requested and received approval to extend it to those that predated January 1, 2008, and then went back another time for January 1, 2009, in an effort to catch up on those very old overdue part fours where no part four was filed, paperwork might have been lost, staff changes either at the service provider or at the state.

This is just a cleaning up our data project and as of September 30th, we had reduced the number of very old overdue part fours to 37 from actually well over 1000 when we started the project back a couple of years ago.

The one time NPAC scrub following implementation of change order five is getting to be very old itself but we still have if you read through it, the bottom line on the page, we still have 443 over contaminated blocks that need a new block holder.

We have engaged with the states and we have 22 states that were affected, 74 percent of all the blocks on the list were in six states. We heard from all but two states. We requested a deadline for responses from the states by September 30th, but we continue to work with some states that needed more time and we are trying to get that resolved.

Our annual survey, as you know we put out an annual survey. We try to put it out about six months away from the NOWG NANC survey. We use it to improve our performance based on the feedback from the survey and we request survey participants to rate us on a scale of one to five, one being the lowest, five being the highest. We got a 4.67 out of a possible 5.0 this year and so we were quite pleased with that.

And any respondents to the survey who made suggestions or comments, we called them up, talked to them, and sometimes it's an educational process, sometimes it's something that we look at and say oh, we can put that on our list for future change order. We try to be proactive in using the survey to improve our performance.

Pooling website, I mentioned that we had shown our new pooling website to the NOWG. We actually have also shown it to state regulatory staff.

We decided, our Manager actually of Security and Technical Operations

decided this year that based on comments that people were making, and his own observations, and the fact that the website was by technical standards getting old, he decided to begin a voluntary overhaul of the website and he did an extensive revamp of the website which we anticipate rolling out on November 5th.

In addition to improving the website and we know it's an improvement because we've had positive comments from both the regulatory staff at states and the NOWG on our changes, we have also developed some training videos.

And instead of when we have a change order now, to the extent possible, instead of having a training session that people may or may not be able to attend depending on their schedules, we are going to be developing training videos. We have one available on the website now for change order 11 and it got 61 hits over the few days surrounding the rollout of change order 11 and we plan to add more in the future. They are through YouTube but you have to access them through the PAZ website so if you go to YouTube and search for them you won't find them.

But this way somebody can have training. If they miss the training or it didn't fit in their schedule, they can go at anytime and watch the video. They can go for refreshers. If new people come into numbering they will be able to go and look at the training videos and they won't have to wait for a couple times a year when we have training. And we've gotten very positive response for that as well.

Seeking donations project, that's the last thing I have today. We developed a process beginning in late May that we hope would enable us to avert the opening of unnecessary central office codes so that when a service provider comes in and

requests that a rate center designation be changed from excluded to optional, we go to the existing service providers in that rate center and ask them to voluntarily donate blocks so that the entering service provider doesn't have to open a new code.

So far we have obtained voluntary donations for three rate centers in two states so we have averted the opening of three NXX codes and we hope that this will have some sort of snowball down the hill curve.

And that's all I have today. If you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Questions on the report on the data there? A couple of things just to be sure. Change order 17 which is on your chart on page nine shows that it is pending. Did you say that was just approved yesterday?

MS. PUTNAM: We received the contract mod for change order 17 yesterday after I had this --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so we'll put in 10/21/2010 there so it's all caught up, there's nothing pending.

MS. PUTNAM: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good. Are there any applications from states for delegated authority pending, that have been filed, that are pending at the Commission?

MS. PUTNAM: Not at this time.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Not at this time, okay. Any questions or questions from anyone on the phone? Very good. Well, I think we will all look forward to the

training videos on YouTube. Certainly I know that from other state commissions, at least with travel funds for staff and travel funds for commissioners and for all state employees being restricted, travel itself being restricted, more and more organizations who are using the online training, video training, et cetera and video conferencing and web (unintelligible) and tele-seminars, to get the word out and get people trained.

MS. PUTNAM: Yes, and we also found that there are some situations where YouTube is blocked.

CHAIRMAN KANE: By the state technology.

MS. PUTNAM: Yes, either by the state technology offices or by the service provider technology offices and that they can go in and request a bypass for a certain period of time and get in to watch the video.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's good. Thank you very much.

Okay, I think we will take a short 15 minute break right now. We'll come back at 10:50 a.m. Thank you.

(Short Break)

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, if we could come back together. We're back on the record and it is about 10:55 a.m. I think were doing very well with our schedule and agenda here.

We will have the report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group, and I see that they have been allotted 55 minutes so we expect a very robust report.

MR. SACRA: Based on my fast track.

(LAUGHTER)

I'll try to give you back quite a bit of time.

CHAIRMAN KANE: This is item number seven on your agenda.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Good morning, everyone. My name is Gary Sacra. I'm one of the co-chairs of the LNPA Working Group and I believe our other two co-chairs are in the audience, Paula Jordan from T-Mobile and Linda Peterman from One Communications.

Today's report, I'll be giving a brief status of the next day porting implementation that took place on August 2nd, provide just a brief overview of the guide to porting a telephone number that was developed in the working group, a readout of the feasibility determination of NANC 437 which is a peered NPAC architecture proposal that was brought in by Telcordia to the working group, and lastly the status of the next NPAC release 3.4 that will be going in early next year.

Okay, first off the status of the FCC 0941 order implementation. Again this was the next day porting order. It was implemented by the larger service providers on August 2nd of this year and it mandated the ability for the consumer to port their telephone number on a next business day basis if it was a simple port.

The working group continues to monitor the status of the implementation through provider feedback at the working group meetings and on the conference

calls. To date the feedback has been very positive. There were some initial service provider issues with some of their operational support systems that caused some minor bumps but those have been addressed and we continue to monitor that status.

The good news, and I guess if I can steal a line from Amy, is porting is fine. The new NANC process is working. Indications are that we are still on track for the next major milestone in the next day porting order and that comes February 2, 2011, when the smaller carriers in the industry are required to comply with the next day porting order and those would be carriers that have less than two percent of the nation's access lines.

And again we will continue to monitor not only the current implementation but also the implementation post February 2nd, and continue to report back to the NANC.

The working group is considering developing I guess what we'd call a Lessons Learned Document. We have been capturing some of the issues that were discovered during the testing, the pre-implementation phase.

If we have any substantive issues that we believe would be of value to the industry we will get them out as soon as possible, especially for those providers that are going to be implementing February 2nd. If we have some items that we think would be very helpful in a Lessons Learned type document we will get that out and develop it and get it out to the industry.

Any questions so far on the implementation?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Can you give us an idea of the kinds of problems

that did occur even though there were few?

MR. SACRA: They were for the most part coding. It was nothing process wise, it was mostly coding in some of the specific service provider systems that required some redevelopment or recoding work but they were very quickly addressed. But the process itself, the NANC process that was developed is working fine. There was no issue there.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Let's just say for the benefit of our young people here, might ask also and I should have done it earlier, we have a lot of acronyms that we use and a lot of references et cetera, and maybe it would be helpful the first time you refer to it, I mean most of us know what all those things refer to but just what they are.

For our young people, this is for example, if you have a cell phone from one particular company and you want to change to a different carrier, this is the process by which you don't have to get a new telephone number, or if you have a landline in your house and you want to change that number to a cell phone or vice versa, this is porting which is the process by which that number is carried over to the new phone and the new carrier. So it's been a very important focus of the work of this Council here to make that easy for the telephone companies and make it easy for the consumer.

MR. SACRA: Thank you Madam Chairman. It is one thing about this industry we do have a lot of acronyms, that's for sure. In fact we tend to repeat some of them, give them different definitions at times.

Okay, the next item in the report is the guide to porting a telephone number. There is a copy of that appended to this report. It wasn't my intent to actually go through the report in detail. This was an item that was requested at the May 21st NANC meeting and the request was that the working group go back and in light of the next day porting order, we were requested to develop a "consumer friendly guide" to the FCC order 0941 implementation plan.

The attached guide was submitted to the NANC on August 12th. It basically at a very high level serves as a guide for the consumer on how to initiate and schedule a port request with other chosen new service providers, what their expectations should be as the process of the porting order proceeds to completion.

It also provides some guidance on helpful information that they should have at the ready when they initiate discussion with the potential new service provider in order to help that new service provider facilitate the port and insure that it completes on time in a seamless fashion as well.

It also provides some guidance if the consumer needs to change their due date, working with the new service provider to do that. Also if they choose to cancel the port altogether what they can do to initiate that cancellation request.

So I certainly would entertain any questions. Hopefully we've met our directive to put together an easily readable consumer friendly guide to how to port a telephone number.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Don Gray.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. I'd just

like to thank the working group for coming up with that document.

It's one that we've distributed to our consumer advocates in Nebraska and said here's your Rosetta Stone if you will, and they have found it helpful to either distribute when a consumer calls in that really, really is interested because sometimes you do get those phone calls from someone that has a basis in technology, maybe not Telecom but they understand how some of the parts work so they start asking those questions that you may not always be prepared for.

So this has been a good document to be able to send to them, get them up to speed, and sometimes they still don't like the end result but at least they understand the end result that came and so it's a great document for that. I'd just like to thank the group for that effort.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Don. I'll certainly pass that on to the group. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Now Gary, I know you've submitted it to us so we thank you very much for doing that and join in that. Are you asking us to approve this or kind of adopt it, or just take recognition of it, give it some status?

MR. SACRA: That's a good question. Certainly the NANC adoption I think is certainly a positive step and any documentation that we submit to the NANC we certainly would like to have it adopted and endorsed by the NANC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I would also like to be able to have us send it out to all the state commissions. This is something we mentioned last time, for their consumer offices as well as to the members of the NASUCA. I know we've got Jeff

on the phone. Are you still on the phone Jeff?

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. You know, to send it to NASUCA and ask if they would want to distribute it to consumer advocates and anyone else who is dealing with consumers on this and I think in order to do that it would be good to have it have been officially blessed by NANC.

I don't know if everyone has had a chance -- I know it was submitted in August. It was put up on the website I believe for review. If there's any discussion of the document itself, if there's any readiness to say let's accept it and make it official?

MR. SACRA: The working group would welcome that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Is there any discussion on that, any objection to that from anyone? Okay, then I take that as unanimous consent that NANC thanks the working group and accepts the document and adopts it, which doesn't say at some point it might need to be revised but particularly I think with the smaller companies coming online now in a couple of months it would be very useful. Okay, thank you.

Since it was a separate document we should also label that 7A for the record.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The next item on the working group report is the NANC 437 peer-reviewed NPAC feasibility analysis results, NANC 437, and for those that may not be totally familiar with how we designate software changes, we call them NANC change orders and

each one of them has a number, this one being NANC 437.

This was a change order that was submitted by Telcordia to the working group in January of 2009, and Telcordia requested that the working group perform a technical and operational feasibility analysis of their proposal which is a peered NPAC environment, would be a multi NPAC architecture with more than one vendor NPAC platform in a region.

The current architecture as many of you know is a single NPAC platform per region. There are seven NPAC regions in the United States, one in Canada. Each of these seven regions in the United States has a single NPAC platform that has been in place since the initial rollout of local number portability back in 1997, and that single NPAC per region architecture remains in place today.

This proposal is a proposal to consider changing that architecture to allow two or more NPAC vendors and their respective NPAC platforms to interconnect and reside in a single region as peers.

In a peered NPAC environment under this proposal, service providers would choose which NPAC vendor platform they would connect to in a particular region.

So in the ensuing months since January of 2009, Telcordia brought in very detailed functional requirements for the peered NPAC proposal as well as proposed changes to the interface specification and the flows that are contained in them.

The working group devoted significant portions of not only our face-to-face meetings but our conference calls during the 18 months that the feasibility analysis was conducted, as well as we devoted live meeting sessions in order to perform that

analysis.

As I said, the feasibility analysis of NANC 437 consisted of detailed reviews and at times modifications of the functional requirements and the interface specification flows that were proposed under NANC 437.

One of the primary goals that the working group agreed upon early on in conducting the analysis was that we needed to determine whether NANC 437 was technically achievable while not resulting in any degradation to the overall NPAC platform in terms of performance or reliability, nor resulting in any degradation to the overall porting process not only to the consumer but also to service providers.

So we had a somewhat dormant working sub-team of the LNPA working group called the Architecture Planning Team. We brought that back to life in order to perform the feasibility analysis of NANC 437. The Architecture Planning team has now completed that analysis, the feasibility analysis, and service providers have provided their respective positions on the questions of both technical and operational feasibility.

One of the steps that we did take before we posed the question to the participating service providers as to whether or not they felt 437 was technically operationally feasible was to come to consensus on the definitions of both technically and operationally feasible.

So we've provided the actual definitions here but just to paraphrase the definition of technically feasible, basically it meant that a determination of technically feasible means that there were no insurmountable technical issues that

were identified during the detailed analysis of 437.

There was what's called a parking lot matrix that we developed as we were going through the detailed analysis and every time we identified a potential issue or had a question we would document that item in a parking lot matrix. I think we documented 196 items that we went and circled back and discussed. I think some cases were discussed and did a deeper dive in some of the issues as well.

The result in terms of technical feasibility, there is no objections to deeming NANC 437 technically feasible by the participating service providers meaning that it was felt that there were no insurmountable technical implementation roadblocks in order to possibly implement a peered NPAC environment.

As to the question of operationally feasible, and again to paraphrase the actual definition here, a determination of operationally feasible by definition required that the proposed change order is achievable, operationally, and would require an acceptable level of effort not only to implement but maintain a peered NPAC environment and would neither result in any degradation to the overall NPAC platform in terms of performance and reliability, nor would it result in any adverse impact to the overall porting process to both service providers and consumers alike.

The result of that particular question was that there was no clear consensus on one side of the question or the other. The results were that a number of providers felt that NANC 437 would result in an unacceptable level of effort not only to implement but maintain the change order or the environment in terms of performance and reliability and that it would result in process degradation to both consumers and the

service providers involved in the porting process.

On the other hand a number of providers felt that any of the open issues in the parking lot matrix could be overcome and that NANC 437 would result in benefits to the industry in terms of introduction and added competition.

So what the working group decided to do was to develop position papers on both sides of that question. The group of providers that felt that NANC 437 was not operationally feasible developed a position paper detailing their rationale for their position and the providers that felt that 437 was operationally feasible did likewise, they developed a position paper detailing their rationale for why they felt it is operationally feasible.

The next steps that we are going to take in the working group, we are developing a final report that will summarize the ongoing feasibility analysis that took place in the working group since January of '09. We are going to include those position papers in that final report and then we're going to hand that report to Telcordia in response to their request for the working group to perform this feasibility analysis.

At that point the working group will consider its work on NANC 437 complete based on the request that it received. There is a process for how we deal with change orders that have been accepted for working and technical requirement which we did with NANC 437 that have not been implemented. They sit in a pool of accepted but non-implemented change orders and as with any change order that's accepted, when it comes time for possibly a next NPAC release all change orders in

the candidate pool will be considered. So unless otherwise directed that would be what the results of NANC 437, the feasibility analysis would be once we produce our final report.

Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, could you clarify that last statement? I tried to follow the process. You've done the report. You looked at the technical feasibility and found and concluded that it is technically feasible.

Then you looked at operational feasibility and did not have a clear consensus so you'll have two position papers on those two things.

MR. SACRA: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And then that report was going to go to Telcordia.

MR. SACRA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I didn't follow what happens after that in terms of it being a change order that's sitting out there and the next NPAC.

MR. SACRA: Right. Every change order that the working group considers if it does not get implemented in a software release but it is in the category of accepted, just remains in the candidate pool for perhaps a future release.

The process that we go through every time a new NPAC release is developed is we take every change order that had been accepted that's in that pool, and we prioritize as a working group, the service providers prioritize each change order and then we make a determination which change orders would be in the next NPAC release.

So this is an accepted change order. We did agree to do the technical work on it. So again unless otherwise directed it would go into that pool.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, that's what I hadn't caught. This is now considered an accepted change order to go into the pool for possible consideration.

MR. SACRA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And the process for the consideration when it's time for the next NPAC comes here eventually?

MR. SACRA: What we have done historically is when we determine which change orders have reached a high enough priority by consensus in the working group to be considered as candidates for the next NPAC software release, we come and report that to the NANC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Questions? Yes, Don Gray.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. Gary, could you help us understand what process may be used to determine how many approved change orders would go in or how few, how long to get the next change order going, or is it a financial decision or consensus?

MR. SACRA: It's certainly consensus. My experience has been having gone through this a number of times with other software releases for the NPAC, when we prioritize the change orders we use a weighted -- say if there's 20 change orders in the candidate pool, each service provider that's participating in the ranking session will rank those change orders 1 through 20, and sort of like a golf score the lowest score is the highest ranked change order.

And we take like a weighted average of all the votes for each of those change orders, the lowest weighted average being the highest desirable change order and what I've seen historically is that there is definitely a delineation between -- there's a group of change orders that are at the top and then there's a wide gap in the weighted average, and then a bunch of change orders at the bottom and that's typically where we sort of draw the line between everything above the line gets included in the next software release, everything below the line is kept in the candidate pool perhaps for future consideration.

So I don't recall ever having a situation where there was not an obvious place to draw the line, where to determine which change orders fall into the release versus which ones fall out.

MR. GRAY: So as Amy would say there's usually a bright line to help you.

MR. SACRA: Sort of just shines right out, yes.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Speak up, please.

MR. GREEN: This is Kevin Green, Verizon. Gary, when would we expect the final report to be produced and is that something that will come to the NANC as well as go to Telcordia?

MR. SACRA: The current plan right now is to view the first draft at our

November 9th and 10th working group meeting, and we'll have a face-to-face meeting. That will be the first opportunity that the group will have in order to provide comments to the draft report.

Our hopes are to have it completed no later than in the January timeframe and again our intent at this point was to hand it off to Telcordia and certainly they will do with the report what they deemed necessary, but unless requested we were just going to hand it to Telcordia.

MS. SHEEHAN: Cindy Sheehan, Comcast. Gary, you indicated here that both position papers will be included in the final report but through both of those, those that are more in favor of the operational feasibility and those maybe not, is the LNP still going to make a decision based upon the input from both positions in the final report?

MR. SACRA: No, because there was no consensus reached on the question of operational feasibility, that's why we decided to let both sides provide their rationale for their positions and once we include those in the final report and issue the final report we would consider our work to be done unless otherwise directed.

MS. SHEEHAN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So again to clarify a decision on or determination on whether it's operationally feasible isn't necessary for it to be an accepted change order.

MR. SACRA: Right, and if I can just clarify what the term accepted means, accepted in working group speak just simply means that the group has agreed to

work the technical requirements. It has no meaning in terms of whether or not the working group intends on including a particular change order in a future software release.

That takes place during the prioritization process where each change order is viewed on its own merit and there's a determination -- there's a priority process as I walked through earlier, and based on the ranking and where we decide to draw the line, those are the change orders that do get included.

So accepted just means that the working group has agreed to work the technical requirements of a particular proposed change order.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission.
How many service providers participated in the process, Gary?

MR. SACRA: There was a lot more in attendance then actually voiced a position. I believe that the total providers that voiced an opinion was probably around 15, some on the side of not operationally feasible, some on the side of operationally feasible. There were several more providers that were in attendance during the 18 months of analysis but chose not to provide a position.

MR. GRAY: Okay, so 15 out of possibly how many could have?

MR. SACRA: I would venture a guess of perhaps upwards and north of 30.

MR. GRAY: Okay, thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Jeff (Unintelligible). Just wanted to clarify what I think I heard. So while there's a lack of consensus on operational feasibility it is

possible the change order would go through but unlikely, is that what you're saying? Unlikely because it would get ranked highly, but it's still possible to go through?

MR. SACRA: Again, if we determine that there's a need for another NPAC software release, if we follow our historical process, this would be one of the change orders that would be in the candidate pool for consideration.

I would suspect that some providers may rank it higher than others. Obviously those that felt that it was not operationally feasible may not rank it as high as those that did.

How the ranking session would play out I couldn't even offer a guess at this point. Actually if it gets to that point, again there has to be a determined need for a new NPAC software release before any change order is considered to be in that release.

MALE SPEAKER: Right, and so the reason I was asking the question is, is there a limit on the number of change orders? Suppose there was only a handful of change orders but nobody particularly was interested in them, what would happen?

MR. SACRA: We set no limit in terms of how many change orders we recommend in the next release. What we do remain cognizant of, since we don't talk dollars in the working group, we talk level of effort in terms of development so we do remain cognizant of how many change orders we may be considering for a particular release that have a high level of effort.

And that not only is from an NPAC standpoint but we consider level of effort for the service provider systems as well, their service order activation systems, their

local service management systems, all that comes into play when we determine sort of where to draw the line above which gets included, below which does not. Level of effort certainly plays into that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So you don't have any particular prediction on when we might be getting a determination from you all that there's a need for a new NPAC release? How often do they get --

MR. SACRA: I mean they average one every two years so we're putting 3.4 in, release 3.4 early next year. But again, and I'm speaking strictly what our historical change order process is, how we treat every change order that comes before the working group.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, sir.

MR ZAMLONG: Joel Zamlong from Telcordia. I just wanted first to take the opportunity on behalf of Telcordia to thank the LNPA working group for the work that was done in going through this feasibility analysis.

As Gary indicated it did take 18 months and the number of issues that were looked at I think attest to the diligence that the group did in assessing both the technical and operational issues.

So from that point of view, we also appreciate all the participation that the service providers as well as the vendors that actively participated had in that.

Again I think at the end of the day what it ends up, this sort of puts on the table an option for potentially another architecture that could be looked at that could bring additional competitive advantages, that could be looked at when you look at an

NPAC solution and that's something that as this plays out, it's a matter of I assume, that as a change order, NANC could potentially further investigate or be interested in what the implications could be of a solution like this.

So again I wanted to take the opportunity to thank the LNPA working group and also NANC for supporting this.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions on that item? Okay, thank you.

MR. SACRA: And speaking of release 3.4, the last item in the report, release 3.4 is currently under development. It contains a number of operational and performance enhancements not only to the NPAC but the interfaces to the service provider service order activation systems and their local service management systems and some enhancements to the overall porting process. And any enhancement to the NPAC in the downstream system certainly enhances the porting process itself.

One of the main change orders in 3.4 is an increase in the through put rate, the required through rate between the NPAC and the downstream service provider systems.

That increase in through put was deemed necessary due to some service providers and some of the increased volumes that they were anticipating in the upcoming years so it was deemed necessary to increase that through put rate so that porting could continue at the rapid pace that we're able to port numbers today.

Release 3.4 is scheduled for industry testing in the February/March 2011

timeframe and is scheduled for a regional rollout in the March to May timeframe.

The way we've handled the rollouts in the industry is we'll pick one region to be the first guinea pig if you will of an NPAC release. That gets loaded and it soaks for a couple of weeks before we continue the rollout with the remaining regions. So we'll do the first region once we select what that first region will be.

That will happen in March. We'll wait two weeks, do three more regions and then wait another three weeks, and do the remaining three regions plus the industry test bid and that will finish us up in May of 2011.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions on this item? Okay, thank you very much. Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. I wanted to circle back around portability. The thought occurred to me, has the working group looked into what may be done or could be done is a better way to phrase it for porting type one numbers in a rural environment such as Nebraska?

That becomes a real issue when the consumer doesn't know that his number really is allocated to an incumbent carrier and a wireless provider using it and the porting gets to be real messy sometimes and more then once we've seen that get caught in a doo-loop that's just almost impossible to get out of.

MR. SACRA: We actually do have a process up on the working group's website. A lot of the type one numbers have been handled through various projects to get them converted from type one to conventional type two wireless numbers which means taking them off a wireline provider's office switch where the calls are

routed through in order to get to the type one carrier and their customer.

We've converted a lot of those through various projects to convert them to type two so that their routing actually takes place through the access tandem and is actually directly assigned on to the wireless carrier's switch.

I understand that there are still some remaining and probably a lot of those in rural areas are remaining type one numbers.

We've probably converted in the hundreds of thousands over the past years' type ones to get them to more conventional type two wireless numbers. There is a process that I believe is included in that document on the website for actually porting individual type one numbers.

It certainly has to involve as you alluded to Don and rightfully so, it involves the wireline carrier where the type one number is actually assigned on their switch in order to get that number ported to whatever wireless carrier the number is being ported to.

There is complexity involved because you really have I guess three providers perhaps involved in the port, the winning carrier plus the old wireline carrier where the number is actually -- their switch is actually routed through, and then the type one provider that's serving the end-user. But I believe that process is documented up on our website.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Are there any questions from anyone on the phone? Okay, thank you very much.

MR. SACRA: Thank you. I gave back a little bit of time.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's right, very good. I appreciate all that, for all your work on that. Very technical but very important.

Let's see, well we are ahead of time for lunch so let's go on to item number eight, report of the North American Portability Management LLC.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT
LLC (NAPM LLC)**

MR. CLAY: Good morning, NANC. My name is Mel Clay. I'm a co-chair of the NAPM LLC and I share that responsibility with Tim Decker from Verizon Communications.

For the benefit of the young people that are in the audience, the North American Portability Management, known as the NAPM LLC, is a limited liability corporation that was established to manage the contract between the NPAC vendor and the industry.

The current vendor is NeuStar and there are right now nine service providers that are members of the NAPM LLC.

Our report today is basically made up of about three or four items. The new member recruitment, we have kept that as a high priority for us. There are nine members right now and we're always looking for new service providers that would like to become members.

There has been a company that has expressed a strong interest in becoming a member and we sent that company our membership package and we're waiting for

their reply. Hopefully we'll get a reply from them probably around the first of the year.

Approval of an SOW 79 which was an amendment to the contract, the NAPM LLC approved SOW 79 back in May of 2010, and this amendment provides change orders that will enhance the functionality of the NPAC.

It allows service providers to create records using a pseudo LRN without stipulating that the downstream network elements be updated for voice routing instructions. It's allowing service providers to do work in their system using the NPAC without overloading the LMS downstream for other service providers.

The future of NPAC subcommittee, the LLC formed a standing committee back in March of 2009 that is charged with determining the recommendations for the future of NPAC including the developing of an RFI and a RFP.

The announcement of an RFI and vendor qualifications was sent to the FCC for public announcement and since this was put in here, that was sent in August of 2010. Later in August or either early September that announcement went out.

And this is just a piece of what the announcement was trying to say. "In preparation for the RFP, the NAPM LLC will issue a request for information in the fourth quarter of 2010 and begin to pre-qualify potential vendors. Beginning on December 1st, interested parties may visit the NAPM LLC website", and the website is listed here, "and select the RFI/RFP tab for additional information on how to send in an RFI or how to get the prequalification information. Requests for the website's logins may be submitted beginning November 15th."

That went out as a public announcement from the FCC on our behalf.

The next thing you see here is a revised timeline. I believe at the last meeting I presented a timeline for the RFP process and that timeline has been revised slightly and this is the revised timeline here. It's kind of complicated so I don't think we need to go through it. If there are any questions on the timeline we'll certainly be glad to address them.

The NAPM LLC will continue to keep the NANC informed of all RFP activity.

The last thing here, on the peering model that Gary just mentioned, NANC 437, to give a little bit of history, Telcordia came to the NAPM LLC with some proposals for future NPAC back in 2008, I believe is correct.

And the peering model was one of the proposals that Telcordia presented to us. The NAPM LLC is not a technical body so we were not able to tell if the peering model was technically feasible so we asked Telcordia to find an industry expert to determine the feasibility of the peering model. They chose the LNPA working group as that industry expert.

At the end of that there was supposed to be a report which is going to take place and Telcordia had asked to come back to us with the report to talk to us about the peering model, the feasibility of the peering model.

Telcordia has contacted the NAPM LLC and requested that they be able to come in and present their side of the technical feasibility issue and we have agreed to allow Telcordia to come in and give their side at the NAPM LLC.

But at this point because of the RFP process that we are going through I'd like to also offer that same invitation to any other vendor that would like to come and give their position on the technical feasibility of the peering model. Just contact either Tim or myself and we will make arrangements to have the vendor come in and be a part of our meeting, to give their side of the story.

Now all of this should take place after Telcordia has received the report from the LNPA working group.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Go over that again, perhaps the timing may clip some of the questions because I believe the previous report was that the final report - - well, first of all the technical feasibility has been determined, that it is technically feasible, that the final report which will address also the issue of operational feasibility or at least will include positions on the issue of operational feasibility will be in draft form in November and before the group and it won't be until January, that was their target for a final report.

MR. CLAY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And looking at your timeline here, well, this is an RFI that went out, okay, not an RFP first of all. And then, when would the RFP itself be issued?

MR. CLAY: I believe the timeline for the RFP is I believe the fourth quarter of 2011.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So that give time in that process to determine whether or not the RFP will allow, ask for, or rule out more than one provider, is that

correct?

MR. CLAY: More than one provider in the same region.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The same region, yes.

MR. CLAY: There's also a possibility that through the RFI process that we may get information that we have to look at on having more than one provider in several regions including -- let me repeat that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Different providers in different regions.

MR. CLAY: Different providers in different regions but more than one provider for all seven regions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So you've set up a timeline. The two timelines working together will provide for that information to be available before the RFP is written.

MR. CLAY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. We'll go to questions. Rosemary, do you have a question?

MS. EMMER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) we're good.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Yes, a question here.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications. Mr. Clay, did the NAPM consider opening up the discussion of the peering model discussion for public -- so anybody interested party could (unintelligible), have an open session of the NAPM?

MR. CLAY: Suzanne, the NAPM LLC, of course we know has an open

session that anybody is able to come to. We were arranging for Telcordia's visit with us in the closed portion of our agenda because I'm sure Telcordia will be telling us things that they want to have in the closed portion of the agenda.

If there's something that a non-member would want to bring to us on this subject we could put it on our agenda during the open portion of the meeting and if you or any other service provider that's not a member wanted to discuss this with us then yes, it could be in the open portion.

MS. HOWARD: So the discussion is only open to vendors?

MR. CLAY: Right now Telcordia is a vendor. They've brought this to us as a proposal. We are just giving them the courtesy of putting their position in front of us to close the loop on the proposal that they brought to us.

If service providers that are not members want to discuss this at the NAPM LLC we would put it on the open portion of our meeting but there would have to be a request.

MS. HOWARD: Are your meetings, the public portion, openly published on the website?

MR. CLAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I just want to reiterate that we are having a membership drive so folks who would like to attend the LLC and become a member so they could be a part of these discussions, they're welcome to.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, and what are the requirements to be a member?

MS. EMMER: Oh, well, working through the co-chairs and getting all of the information off the website that we have that's public and finding some money.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I mean is it open to anyone who wants to be a member or are there criteria?

MR. CLAY: There are criteria to be a member. Any service provider that is ported or chooses to or wants to port numbers can qualify to be a member. The qualifications, I don't want to try to go through them off the top of my head but any service provider that wants to port numbers or has an intention to port numbers can be a provider.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell for Cox Communications. Mel, I have a couple questions about the RFP/RFI process. You have on the timeline that there is going to be sent a courtesy copy of the RFI and a courtesy copy of the RFP to the FCC. I believe a member of NANC asked if we would be included on the RFI at the last meeting.

MR. CLAY: When the RFI goes out the courtesy copy will be sent to the FCC 30 days before it's announced, before it goes public. Once it goes public we will then present all the information to the NANC.

MS. O'DONNELL: Both RFI and RFP?

MR. CLAY: Yes.

MS. O'DONNELL: Okay, then the other question I have is you said that notification of vendor selection will be sent to NANC and the FCC. I mean by FCC rule NANC selects the vendor so is it notification or is it a request for approval?

MR. CLAY: I'm sorry?

MS. O'DONNELL: By FCC rule NANC selects the NPAC vendor, the LNP administrator.

MR. CLAY: No, the NAPM LLC actually selects the vendor and we do that on behalf of the FCC. The NANC has oversight of the NAPM LLC but we actually are managing the contracts on behalf of the FCC.

MS. O'DONNELL: So when I'm reading 47 CFR 52.25 (c), (d) and (f) NANC shall select the (unintelligible) portability administrator, that doesn't apply anymore?

MR. CLAY: Well, I actually can't answer your question without looking at this but actually the responsibility of selecting a vendor has been with the NAPM LLC.

MS. O'DONNELL: I'm respectfully disagreeing with that.

MR. CLAY: Okay, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will look into that. Thank you. Yes.

MR. NAKAHATA: Madam Chairman, John Nakahata on behalf of Telcordia. Just a follow-up to Ms. O'Donnell's question here. Actually it's also 52.25(d), and I guess my question was how the RFP development process contemplated complying with 52.25(d) which states, "The NANC shall determine

where one or more multiple administrators should be selected, how the LNPA should be selected, the specific duties of the LNPA”, and it goes on with some other further details. So how does the RFP development process contemplate compliance with this specific FCC rule?

MR. CLAY: I would just like to try to address that. I believe the NANC on behalf of the FCC put together the LLCs at the beginning of portability to act on their behalf and we have acted on behalf of the NANC and the FCC since the inception of portability.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So to clarify, you’re saying that it was a prior action of the NANC delegating that authority to the LLC?

MR. CLAY: To the LLC, correct. There were originally (unintelligible) LLCs that were designated to manage the contracts and that was then combined into one LLC with the nine members that we have.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. I think this is something we will look into and several other members have also I think raised this issue, just asking questions about the process because to my mind there’s a difference between managing a contract and selecting the contractor.

If there’s some specific documentation, if we could ask someone to provide that to us, the specific action delegating the development of the RFP and delegating the selection of a vendor to someone other than the NANC.

MR. CLAY: And I believe there’s a meeting in December.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MR. CLAY: I will go to our attorney and get our authority to do what we do and have it in the NAPM report in December.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I wasn't questioning your authority. I just want some documentation. A lot has been done and sometimes I find that the government as well as the private sector, things have been historically thought and for good reasons, but there may not have been documentation for a delegation. Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. Mel, another thing perhaps you could provide us that would be helpful in understanding, having gone through some of this type of process for Nebraska's broadband mapping initiative, RFI/RFPs ranking and vendor award, it got to be tedious tasks and sometimes people shake their heads and go, how did you get from point A to point D, E, or F.

And perhaps you could provide and not necessarily here because I'm not going to ask you to do it off the top of your head, but there's an RFI process, that leads to an RFP, which leads to a vendor submittal and ranking of those submittals, and then an award process.

And perhaps as part of the information you provide back you could indicate - - you've got the timelines in here but there's not an indication of what participation or oversight I'll say that the NANC may have in that, because I think there has been some issues raised that at least awareness -- and I did hear a couple of comments that led me to believe that NANC was going to see something after the LLC had made decisions and I think knowing about the process beforehand may help us in looking

at this in the total picture. So I would appreciate that.

MR. CLAY: Okay, so Don, what you're asking for is an explanation of the process that we're going through and how we're going through it, is that correct?

MR. GRAY: Well, I think the explanation is perhaps there, but more who all is going to be involved in that. Is it just going to be the nine service providers, they're going to review the RFI information and from that write the RFP, or is the LLC going to share at least with the NANC here, what are the key points that came from RFI that we think are important issues that the RFP should address, either their identification of similar technical or operational capabilities that already exist or in the case of the peering, here are new things that we think should be included in the next round RFP.

And so just kind of help us understand how that process is going to go and who's going to be involved in it. Thank you.

MR. CLAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, any other questions? Yes.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, Qwest. I just wanted to make a comment that when the RFI notification was sent out, that would have been an opportune time if parties felt that it was inappropriate for the NAPM LLC to be moving ahead with this process to make a statement about that and no statement was made. So I just wanted to point that out for the record.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's also the first time we've gotten the report on it I think for many of us. This is the first time I've seen this timeline. I'm not

questioning it, I'm just saying sometimes things are sent and we get noticed on it.

MS. RETKA: The timeline has been in previous presentations.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right, previous reports but when this RFI which went to the FCC -- well, it hasn't gone to the FCC yet. It's going on November 1st, is that correct?

MR. CLAY: The FCC will be getting a copy of it before November 1st, yes.

MS. RETKA: However there was a notice of the RFI that they have distributed and that would have been an opportune time to make a statement that we don't expect the NAPM LLC to do that, instead we expect whoever else they would have expected to do that, and there has been no statement like that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I appreciate that, thank you. Anything else?

MALE SPEAKER: I don't have a particular position on this issue one way or another with respect to the ability of the NAPM to act here but I think just for the purpose of integrity of the process the answer to one of the legal issues is whether the NANC has the authority to delegate its responsibilities to a third party so just food for thought on that issue of delegation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I agree it's an important issue before we get too far down the road. Thank you very much.

MR. CLAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Actually it is 12 o'clock and we do have four more items to do. I will ask the pleasure of the group. We can go straight ahead and we

might be able to finish all this in an hour or we might take a break and come back.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary, Sprint Nextel. I would like to push through.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, does anybody object to not having their lunch at 12 o'clock?

MALE SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) Future of Numbering Working Group Co-chair. Don't object but my copies are up the hill at ATIS of our presentation. If you can do without paper copies, Don is glad to do the report. I can give you one copy and you can print your own, but we don't have the paper copies here.

We miss-communicated as to who was printing them. They were being printed so I could pick them up at lunch and bring them. So no objection, it's just you don't have your paper copies.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right. You are the last ones and I guess they were included in what was sent out but if you can get them here, because you are last, you know, in the next 45 minutes to an hour fine, otherwise we'll go ahead if nobody objects, and we can talk about the Future of Numbering without the paper copies. Yes.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. If there's an opportunity just for a few minutes for caucus time that would be helpful and perhaps when he goes out to get it we can break just for a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: On the Future of Numbering?

MR. CANDELARIA: Well, actually on the report on the Telcordia dispute.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, you were probably hoping to have some time at lunch to talk about that. Okay, well, that would be up next so why don't we take a ten minute break and then we'll come back and finish up the agenda.

(Short Break)

CHAIRMAN KANE: If we can come back together. Okay, we're back on the record.

Before we move to item number nine, I want to go back for just a couple of minutes to the previous item on the RFI and the RFP because I did have a conversation during the break because I didn't have anybody to caucus with, which I think will help clear up some things.

It's my understanding now, from the folks I was talking to, is that it was the FCC that asked the NAPM to do an RFI process and that the purpose of the RFI is to gather information from interested parties as to what might be included or should be included in the RFP and that that is the purpose of the RFI, to get ideas on what we would like to see included in that next generation NPAC.

That that proposed RFI is going to be presented to the FCC on November 1st and that for some reason there appears to be a need for the FCC to have 30 days to look at it although there's not an expectation the FCC would make any changes in it or suggest changes in it, and that it will then be put out to the public for the public to provide information, responses to it as to what they would like to see in the NPAC.

Now the time period for that is about six weeks from December 1st to January 15th. And the concern I raised and (unintelligible) someone to answer is

how will the NAPM be sure that that is widely disseminated, and that this very good desire is to have a lot of input from as I understand it the consumer groups, think tanks, people in the industry, stakeholders, et cetera.

Besides putting the RFI in the Federal Register, which is what the FCC normally does, are there any other distribution or announcement channels that the NAPM was thinking of using to be sure that you're going to get responses from the broad group of hopefully intelligent, innovative, concerned people that you're looking for. And if someone has an answer to that, that's fine.

I would just ask NAPM to think about that, a little time about other ways to publicize and distribute this so that you know that you are going to get the kind of response that you want.

MR. CLAY: The subcommittee that is working through the RFI/RFP process, the chairs of that subcommittee are in the room so they have heard what you are asking but I believe right now our process is to let the FCC put it out through the Federal Register and that was the process that we were using.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And actually I suggest that once that has been done by the FCC, you all know that there are other channels that could be tapped, that the FCC has put it out, can be brought to their attention so that you do get -- I don't want you to end up January 15th having gotten few responses or just hearing from with all due respect everybody same old, same old.

That if the FCC is asking you to do the RFI process so you get some new input, think about and prepare for once the RFI has been officially issued by the FCC

of using your own channels to let other people know about it.

MR. CLAY: I'm sure that will be taken into consideration.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. And we'll ask for a report on that at the December NANC meeting. Thank you.

All right, now we'll move on to less controversial matters.

(LAUGHTER)

TELCORDIA DISPUTE RESOLUTION TEAM: TELCORDIA APPEAL

Item number nine which is the report of the Telcordia Dispute Resolution Team. You should have before you the report from myself and Don Gray who are the remaining two members of the original three member Telcordia Dispute Resolution Team which was distributed today, and I'm going to read through it because I know that the folks on the phone do not have a paper copy of this, it wasn't sent out electronically.

This has not been an easy issue to deal with. I appreciate everyone's input on it and I myself have also been up to my ears in another related telecommunication issue which is Smart Grid which is what we're dealing with at our commission, my day job.

But as you know, the Dispute Resolution Team was appointed by the former Chairman of the NANC to review the request of Telcordia Technology, Inc., for the North American Numbering Council to resolve the dispute concerning NANC change orders for 29, 430 and 435 and since Tom Koutsky left the NANC it has been myself and Don Gray from the state of Nebraska.

And this dispute eventually involves two issues, one which is substantive and one which is procedural. The substantive issue we summarized as, do the uniform resource identifier URI fields in change orders for 29, 430, and 435 meet the requirement of 47 CFR 52.25F, that the fields in the number portability administration center “shall be limited to the information necessary to route telephone call to the appropriate telecommunication carriers.

And then secondly, the procedural issue is was the full appropriate process followed in the adoption of these change orders.

The team, that is Don and I, and building on the work that was done when Tom was a member of the team also, we’ve reviewed all of the comments that have been filed in the various stages of this matter before the NANC. The comments are in the public record. They’re available on the NANC website so we did not feel either that it was necessary or that it would be timely to either summarize them or comment on them.

I even find when my staff gives me comments, summaries of the comments that have been filed in any of our public dockets, there’s always some interpretation that slips in so we thought it would be better, more objective just to note that they are all in the record and that everyone can read them and make their judgment about it.

And based on our judgment we make findings and recommendation. Let me say two things. In making these recommendations we were mindful the authority of the NANC has been specifically limited to advising and to making recommendations to the FCC, not making interpretations of the law.

And I would add that perhaps Don and I both as regulators, as a commissioner, as staff, are particularly mindful that at least from a regulator's point of view that while you might want something to be in the law or you might want something to be -- or if it makes sense that that's the way it ought to be, if it's not specifically and obvious in the law or in the regulation you really are going outside the bounds of your ability to make a decision.

So on the first question of should the fields in question be in the NPAC, we make these findings, that 47 CFR 52.25F limits the NPAC database to information necessary to route what is called "telephone calls". That's just a straight quote.

However the meaning of the term telephone calls in 1996 when 47 CFR 52 was written probably has very little resemblance to the contemporary at least popular definition or in various ways definition of telephone calls. That there appears to be unanimous agreement the industry needs a better definition of telephone calls and voice communications. You can see that throughout various decisions and various comments that were filed that were referenced in various comments.

And then on the other hand, you know, that the calls, whatever they are, are being placed and received successfully today under the current system of URIs, required URIs, and that the system is working with the current level of URIs.

Our findings on the issue of was the appropriate process followed in the adoption of these change orders, we determined that the record is not clear that the full NANC ever made an expressed or a formal determination that the proposed URIs are "necessary to route" and there's a correction here, just cross out record is

not clear because we wanted to make that twice, that the record is not clear that the full NANC made a formal determination that the proposed URIs are “necessary to route telephone calls to the appropriate carrier”.

And based on those findings and conclusions we have two recommendations. We recommend the NANC ask the FCC to issue a notice of proposed rule making on the definition of telephone call and we recommend that therefore that the fields in question not be activated at this time and that once the FCC has made a determination through its process of the definition of telephone call that these fields if they are necessary to implement, that definition would then be appropriate to include.

That is our recommendation. Don, do you want to add anything?

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission.

Nothing beyond what Chairman Kane has already said. This has been a process that went on longer than I think any of us intended. It wasn't our intent but the process was the process and losing Chairman Koutsy as part of the process kind of threw up some roadblocks in terms of time available to do this.

And we also as Chairman Kane talked about, we struggled with what could we do and what should we do and I appreciate that I think everybody understands there is a difference between that but as regulators we felt we didn't have a lot of latitude in what we could bring back to the table as our recommendation looking specifically at what is in front of us and what we had a basis to decide on.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Okay, so the recommendations are up for

discussion.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) Jeff
(Unintelligible). I don't know if that's on or not.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It is now.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, thank you for the report and first I would ask
could it be provided electronically?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, it will be, absolutely.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, so I understand that it was prepared late and
couldn't be beforehand.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It was finalized but we didn't have time to get it in
electronically but it will be, it should be on if they have an electronic copy of it at the
FCC now.

MALE SPEAKER: All right, great, thank you. Secondly, I think we've a
limited amount of time. I would suggest that CenturyLink, that it's pretty
(unintelligible) to act on this report and to offer any formal recommendations today.
We haven't had enough time to consider it internally.

I will note in regards to the specific dispute, we also have a concern about
what could be the unintended consequences of an NPRM on the definition of a
telephone call, a phrase that appears often in both the CFR and commissioned orders,
often with somewhat different meanings I believe.

So just note at this point, while we can't vote one way or another on these
recommendations, we do have some serious concerns about that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Respectively I don't understand the number four finding. "On the other hand calls are being placed and received successfully today under the current system of required URIs. The system is working with the current level of URIs."

So I don't understand that particular sentence because calls are not being placed and received successfully because these fields are being used today. There are only two entries in the NPAC current for the SMS or MMS fields, and those two particular entries were test fields and we monitor, you know, the VR report. We monitor this on a weekly basis.

So respectively I don't understand why that is part of the report or perhaps there is bad information that's out there that needs to be corrected. I'm not sure.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. I think this comes back then to the definition of telephone call. The NPAC from our perspective from what we read was set up for -- voice communications and voice calls are being completed at this time, correct?

MS. EMMER: Sure, voice calls are being completed today.

MR. GRAY: Are being completed, and what you I believe are suggesting is not being completed is SMS, MMS, and pictures that may not be getting to the appropriate party if people only use the NPAC.

MS. EMMER: But it says today the system is working with the current level

of URIs and my only point is there's only two URI entries in the NPAC right now and they're just for tests so I mean nobody -- the horses aren't out to pasture with this, the carriers are waiting and, you know, some carriers are actually busting at the seams to use these fields.

Carriers have been very patiently waiting to be able to use these fields including Sprint for a very long time, in fact I think this is going on five years so recommending that the fields not be -- anyway at this point I just want to talk about that one particular line and I would like to know if there is bad information out there.

I'd like to know on the record, has someone been saying that more carriers are using those fields, is anyone hearing that because I'm getting a weekly report and there's only two, both of those fields are for tests -- there were only two entries and both were for tests.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think our point was that pictures are going through and SMS is going through. It's being transmitted. Don.

MR. GRAY: I think that was the point we were making, was that communications however you want to define it is working today. Is it working with only the NPAC, no and we understand that.

And to your point about people champing at the bit to get it in the NPAC and move on, I think that could be, yet I believe this week there was an announcement by another major carrier that said we're not waiting any longer, we're using an alternative form and do not intend to use the NPAC for routing of this type call.

So there's things on both sides of the street here and again as the

Commissioner said, we had to look at this as a perspective of what does the law say and not interpret what that law meant.

MS. GAUGLER: Tiki Gaugler with XO Communications. Just for a clarifying question, I understand what Rosemary is saying. I'm not sure -- by this statement here when you say that it is working under current level of URIs, are you including these new fields or are you saying without those fields, and that may be the question that Rosemary is asking.

MR. GRAY: Without the fields.

MS. GAUGLER: Without the fields. And then Rosemary, are you asking whether right now those fields are being used because you're saying that --

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. To me this sentence indicates that carriers are actually using these fields today.

MS. GAUGLER: Okay, I think that's what I was trying to point out. I think what they're trying to say is different then what you're saying if that makes sense. Okay, so maybe that's the clarifying point that she is trying to make is that when you say the current level of URI, is there currently in the database --

MR. GRAY: Which is zip.

MS. GAUGLER: And so that's the distinction, is that they are currently there. Those URIs are not being used as readily as carriers would like to use them and so perhaps the clarification needs to be that it's other fields, not those URIs if that makes sense as far as --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you for that. I think that clarifies what we

meant. I'm not an engineer. Yes.

MR. NAKAHATA: John Nakahata on behalf of Telcordia. I think I want to make sure that it is clear, that that clarification is very helpful but my recollection of the record is having been through it fairly extensively is that there are not specific examples provided of traffic that could not be delivered using -- in the absence of these URI fields, that this traffic was going through in the absence of the use of these URI fields.

MS. MCNAMER: Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile. I guess I have a question on the first recommendation, that the NANC go back, and not that we want to make a decision today but to go back and ask for an NPRM. Is the NANC going to also consider doing an IMG to come up with a recommendation of what we believe the definition should be for the FCC?

CHAIRMAN KANE: That is not our recommendation, no. (Unintelligible) clarify two words about definition of telephone call for the purpose of this part of the CFR, not global definition.

MS. TIFFANY: Sue Tiffany with Sprint Nextel. The point they're making about the calls going through without the URI fields, it's true because each and every carrier has made separate arrangements to make sure that the SMS and the data, the pictures you're sending, the football games that you're watching are flowing through.

But when you port the numbers, sometimes those separate and distinct -- each individual carrier process fails and then you have customers calling in saying what's

wrong, I can't text message, why aren't my pictures getting to my mother, and you have to go through the process of finding out where in the system who didn't do what so that those ported numbers can still have their text messaging, and picture, and their data process flow through. What the URIs in Sprint's opinion would do is to make it more efficient.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) AT&T. I think this discussion actually shows that the real sort of the rubber hits the road here -- and not on what the definition of a telephone call is, and I think, you know, the idea that we need a clarification of the definition of a telephone call would solve this issue, I think that's not right.

I think the rubber hits the road on what it means to be necessary for routing a telephone call and so there's kind of one sort of proposed definition of necessary which means if you can do it without this field then it's not necessary, but there could be other definitions of necessary that are not as strict as that and ultimately I think this really is an issue -- this decision of what it means to be necessary for routing a telephone call is not an issue that's within the, you know, really core competency of this organization. It's a legal decision.

It reminds me, you know, thinking back to law school of this famous case of *McCullough v. Maryland* where the Supreme Court of the United States had to decide whether establishing a national bank was necessary and proper under the language in the Constitution and there's this whole discussion about what it means to be necessary and that's why I feel that we ultimately cannot resolve this.

You know, having the FCC do a NPRM on what the telephone call is isn't really the issue that needs to be resolved here. So I mean my take on it is I appreciate the work that people have done here but ultimately the resolution of this issue isn't really an issue in my opinion for this body. It's an issue for the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's very interesting. I wrote down (unintelligible) several speakers were speaking, necessary versus convenient versus efficient. Actually in the regulatory world we issue certificates of convenience and necessity. So are you suggesting that perhaps an alternative recommendation might be that the FCC determines what the word necessary be?

MALE SPEAKER: Well, I guess what I'm saying is I actually don't think that in terms of recommending action to the FCC there is much that the Council can recommend to the FCC to do. Ultimately the FCC knows how to do its job.

You know, if the FCC has a specific question about what's a telephone call, if they actually had such a question maybe that's something we could think about but if the question is what does it mean to be necessary, I don't think that's something particularly -- you know, I just don't see how that's within our core competency.

MR. NAKAHATA: John Nakahata on behalf of Telcordia. While there is certainly a legal question imbedded here, I think that then that raised the next question which is okay, the FCC did say the NANC shall determine what information is necessary, that that's what's in the rule. So if NANC doesn't feel like it can actually make that determination then these fields should not be in the database.

The rule says NANC determines what is necessary so that's where the procedural issue here I think is important. The question here is are we going to follow the rule. The rule says there is a limit on what goes in the database. And the rule also says in the case of a dispute NANC determines whether that is within or outside the limit.

In this case there is no place that NANC has made that determination. I think we can all agree that NANC itself has not made that determination. It didn't make it change order 400 and it hasn't made it since change order 400. The only thing you can look at is the FCC said the industry should reconsider but reconsider in the context of a rule that says NANC shall determine means it has to come back to NANC for a determination. In the absence of determination these fields cannot be in the database. The test of the rule has not been met.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and I think our second finding, we did not find any clear evidence that NANC had made a formal determination that the proposed fields were necessary.

MALE SPEAKER: John may or may not be right but the question of whether the rule has been complied with again is a question -- as a Council we can decide what we think the facts are and we can say to the FCC or as anyone, here's our consensus about what the facts are but whether the rule has been complied with, I don't think that's a decision this Council can make.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I wanted to echo the concerns expressed by Century Link concerning the unintended consequences of the

first recommendation concerning the definition of a telephone call. And I'm not sure whether we reach consensus on that issue today going forward.

I would ask for the opportunity for whatever document or manner we do convey this request should we decide to request this definition, that we have an opportunity to review the request itself.

The reason why is, again this is a very loaded issue that has implications well beyond numbering. It has implications for how certain entities are regulated at the state level, local level, so we want to make sure that what we ask is limited to this number universe.

The second issue I wanted to ask about was the second -- it's number two under should the field in question be in the NPAC, however the meaning of the term telephone calls in 1996 as written most likely has little resemblance to contemporary definition of telephone calls. I'm wondering what the contemporary definition of telephone calls is that you're referring to or if it's better just to say contemporary use of the term telephone calls.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's not referring to any particular definition, but contemporary understanding or common usage or various usage of the term telephone calls.

MS. GAUGLER: Tiki Gaugler with XO Communications. I have a few questions, comments. First in number three there's a reference here, it says there appears to be near unanimous agreement that the industry needs a better definition of telephone calls and voice communications. I don't see anywhere in the rule where it

states voice communications so I'm wondering where that -- because it's written in quotes here, where that designation came from, from the report.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. I think we were trying to distinguish perhaps that at least our opinion when we reviewed the CFRs that were before us back when a lot of this may have come about was that a telephone call/voice was probably synonymous as opposed to today when someone talks about a telephone call it could well mean -- I mean how many people talk about getting a text message as getting a call or things like that.

I think this continues to circle back around to the expanded definition of communication and how the industry has moved so much faster than the rules and the regulations that are out there, you know, encompass.

MS. GAUGLER: I would agree that often the industry moves faster than the FCC rules however I do believe in '96 the FCC implementing rules were not restricted to voice communication. It doesn't say voice in there and that they intended that they be dynamic to cover things beyond voice communications and that they are more relevant, that they are calls, that there was some communication that's beginning, ending, and that's transmitted there, that they intended in this rule, and that there are already fields in the NPAC that address other things besides just a voice call

And there's been a lot of discussion about whether NANC made a determination because NANC is to determine what is necessary to go in the database. There are many fields that have been added to the database and NANC has

not made a specific explicit determination and that by including them in there NANC is delegated to as we had discussion before of the NAPM LLC, for doing administration of this contract.

And in doing that in the LNPA working group and assessing a change order, they've made determinations of what fields to include in the database of the last 10, 15 years and that has not included an explicit finding in each one of those cases that this was necessary for routing telephone calls.

So I don't think that should be something that hinders this process necessarily. Also I agree with a lot of what Hank said about the fact that this is really what is necessary for routing, not that this is necessary for a telephone call. I think that the definition of what a telephone call is, is less important then whether it is necessary for routing and the intention was to exclude things for OCPNI or other means, not to exclude actual useful routing information from a database that all carriers are going to use and have non-discriminatory access to.

However I disagree that this is an issue that must go to the FCC and can't be decided here. I believe that is a technical issue that this group is perfectly suited to address. How to handle the technical issue of routing a call are the things that many of people around the table do day-to-day and handling that within their companies.

As I said, it is limited but it is only limited to the routing and so we -- or from X perspective I agree with CenturyLink that probably we cannot make an assessment here but I don't believe that we cannot support making a recommendation to the FCC for (unintelligible) for a definition of a telephone call or deactivating these

fields.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I wanted to read to the group the definition of a call as in the LLC agreement. The LLC agreement defines a call as the transmission of information, video, pictures, audio, music, message, text data, or a combination of these by use of messages or transmission of provisioning data associated with information sessions subscribers and network equipment and devices e.g. discovery connection, presence, location authentication, billing usage, maintenance and perimeter negotiation.

This goes on to say the term routing means transporting calls for these purposes, internet addresses and naming protocols, URLs, URIs, IPI addresses, et cetera are considered call routing information. They are associated with the telephone number.

I wanted to put that on the record. I also wanted to put on the record that on February 4, 2008, Dana Shaffer, Wireline Competition Bureau Chief stated to the NANC Chair in part that the industry may reconsider change order 400 rather than holding in abeyance, something we've talked about before, but I wanted to put that there.

And then Sprint's position on this would be recommending that these fields not be activated right now until the FCC actually decides or determines or if they ever would define what a telephone call is. From a Sprint position it would be an unreasonably long delay.

This issue as I mentioned before has been going on for five years and carriers

are just waiting for this issue to be dismissed or decided upon so that they can potentially start to begin to use these.

Therefore Sprint proposes a pass forward to this topic to the agenda next month. We would like to introduce a contribution for the NANC and the FCC to review and discuss at the next NANC meeting, a contribution that we have outlines the issues (unintelligible). It includes all the nuts and bolts and references. It's very good.

Perhaps the NANC can then take both the NANC dispute findings and recommendations sent out today and perhaps they could then take this paper which would be submitted by Sprint and T-Mobile under consideration and we could talk about it at the next NANC meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. And you did share a copy of that draft with me. It is very comprehensive. It is very good. It reaches a different conclusion than Don and I were able to reach but ours is just a recommendation.

My intention is we will come to some resolution on this at the December meeting. I don't want to go into 2011 with this hanging over us. And it is up to the group to reach a consensus.

I feel we have done what we were asked to do. We used our best judgment but it is simply before you and there are alternative inputs. We will come to some kind of consensus, vote if necessary on this issue at the December meeting and move on to other issues.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can I ask Rosemary, were you intending to provide

that before the meeting or during the meeting?

CHAIRMAN KANE: You're going to send it out --

MS. EMMER: I actually have paper copies here that I could give you and then we could electronically --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and we could send it electronically too. Thank you. Cindy.

MS. SHEEHAN: Cindy Sheehan, Comcast. So I think you know in hearing the discussions and looking at the recommendations, one of the things that you kind of mentioned before Chairman Kane, is about the necessity versus the convenience and really I think this is a question of necessity and is it really necessary.

I mean there are other providers, and I'm not sure in the comments that you had under number four about that there are calls that are being placed and received successfully today under the current required URIs, if that is outside of what's in NPAC, that other providers are utilizing other systems and they are successfully doing that but they would just prefer maybe to have it in NPAC.

So I think this is really a question of is it necessary and is it the right place to be in the NPAC database where number portability takes place.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I do think that whatever we vote on in December does need to include a fulfillment of that requirement in the CFR that we find it necessary.

If we require that we find it necessary to the extent is what is -- I don't know

what's been done in the past but if it says that we need to find it's necessary then we need to find it's necessary for it to be included and how we define necessary, how we dispute that is a different issue but I think that is part of our responsibility, whether or not we can come to a conclusion -- or what the rule says, the federal regulation said.

Okay, we have to take a couple more comments and I think we have decided, I think there is a consensus we will come to resolution on this at the December meeting. I'll take a couple more and then we can move on to our last reports before we all eat lunch.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. This paper has just been passed around and I just wanted to clarify with everyone. There are highlights in this document, basically anything that is written that already says a conclusion, if it's highlighted, it hasn't been a conclusion yet.

This is a draft document that we're submitting and so anything that's in yellow including the last two sections I believe. I only highlighted the actual, the section, like section four and section five, that would be one highlight for the entire page. I just knew that I would be copying this and I didn't want to use all the yellow for all these pages.

So please note that the pieces in yellow are the pieces that are biased if you will towards our opinion and our position. The other pieces of it that aren't highlighted are facts and references and talking about the issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. It does provide a very comprehensive

history and the rest is your recommendations. Okay, two more.

We'll add this report and recommendation which comes from Sprint and T-Mobile as 9A for the record. Okay, we've got one, two, three and then we're going to move on.

MR. LANNING: Jeff Lanning, CenturyLink. I just want to clarify and make sure I understand. So for our consideration sometime before the next NANC meeting we'll be receiving the report, is that correct, electronically?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Electronically, yes. What you received in paper will come electronically.

MALE SPEAKER: And we have the (unintelligible) electronically and we'll be receiving the Sprint and T-Mobile report. Is there anything else that we need? I guess I'd ask that it be put together in a convenient fashion for consideration.

And also I guess from listening to the comments I certainly wouldn't be surprised if we don't reach consensus at the December meeting and so I guess it would be helpful if we had some idea of what happens afterwards if we don't reach consensus. In other words we have a black hole.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We then report back to the FCC that we are not able to reach consensus on it. That's what I mean by bringing it to conclusion. After this time if we can't reach consensus, whether it's majority consensus or consensus/consensus, then I would be the one who would report back to the FCC that we cannot resolve this.

MS. REIDY: Karen Reidy, CompTel. On your finding on the report, I just wanted to clarify, that the finding is based on the assumption that someone is using another -- is able to use some other sort of source of getting things, it's not a finding that the calls could be successfully completed based solely on the use of the NPAC, is that a correct understanding?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. REIDY: So I think that also goes to the question of what is meant by necessary and whether when you say something is necessary whether the law actually intended that someone would have to then use another source to complete the calls or whether the information itself is necessary and therefore should be allowed to be in the NPAC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The last word.

MR. NAKAHATA: John Nakahata on behalf of Telcordia. Just three points. One is in terms of the precedent, in terms of non-routing information that has ended up in the database and if the record shows up all of that has been for services that were broken by porting when porting was introduced, that is not the situation we're dealing with here, okay.

The second point I think I'd make is that in terms of the LLC, the NPAC contract between the LLC and NeuStar, that contract never came before this body, that's in fact one of the objections Telcordia has had to those provisions of that contract. It has no official standing.

The third point I'd make, the point that Karen was just making in some ways

was right but what is always -- we have to remember that the NPAC at least right now is a monopoly database funded by a mandatory FCC fee.

You can't compete to provide NPAC services so the question is where is the boundary between the functions that should be provided by that monopoly rate care funded database and things that are provided in the -- can be and are provided in the competitive marketplace and Telcordia feels as much as possible should be done in a competitive marketplace and as little as possible should be done in a monopoly rate payer funded database.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. We will now move on to number ten, report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP

(NOWG)

MS. MCNAMER: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Natalie McNamer. I'm with T-Mobile. My report today won't be as exciting as this discussion.

(LAUGHTER)

I'm one of the tri-chairs of the NOWG along with Laura Dalton with Verizon Communications and Karen Riepenkroger with Sprint Nextel.

On our report today we're going to discuss a little bit about the 2010 NANPA and Pooling Administrator surveys, we recently held a co-chair election, and PA and NANPA change orders. I want to show you who is participating in the NOWG in our upcoming meeting schedule.

On page three we just wanted to inform the NANC that we have reviewed

our current surveys and determined that there will no significant edits for this year needed to the surveys. We are going to be transitioning the surveys for the service providers and regulators to an online format. Currently we usually send a word document and folks have to download it and consolidate it all within their companies and send it back to us.

This year we're going to be sending out links and we'll be accepting the surveys from as many end-users as we get and the NOWG on the backend will consolidate the surveys down to the one response per entity on our end to hopefully get some extra surveys in the coming year.

At the December NANC meeting we will be showing everybody, we'll give you guys the -- we'll still do the word documents. For people who don't have access to the Internet we would still accept that and we will be submitting that to the NANC in December for your approval to distribute in January.

Co-chair election positions - we currently have three co-chairs, two of the terms will be up at the end of the year which is Laura Dalton with Verizon and Karen Riepenkroger with Sprint.

We asked for nominations. Laura Dalton from Verizon was nominated along with Gwen Zhan from Verizon Wireless. Usually when we do tri-chairs we don't have two from one company but we only got two volunteers so they were both elected by acclamation.

Karen had decided not to move forward with being a co-chair and NOWG would like to take this opportunity on the record to thank Karen Riepenkroger with

Sprint for her many, many years of co-chair service to us. She will still be actively participating on the NOWG. We're not going to let her get away that easily with leaving us.

So we are excited that come January 1st we will have a different co-chair and Karen is still going to stay around to help mentor Gwen with our duties as we're figuring out who is going to do what in the future and maybe mix around some of the responsibilities.

At this time I guess we usually have the -- I don't know if they approve the co-chair positions or acknowledge.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will acknowledge without any objection the selection of your co-chairs. We look forward to working with them.

MS. MCNAMER: The next two slides I won't spend a lot of time reviewing because you've seen them. The PA change orders on page five. You'll notice NOWG status is now -- sent and approved recommendation to the FCC. The FCC approved change order 17 yesterday.

Same on the NANPA, they had their change order 19 which the NOWG recommended the FCC approve this week and the FCC approved it yesterday. So things are moving very fast on the change order side which we're happy about and we appreciate the FCC moving so quickly on those.

Slide eight just shows the participating companies of the NOWG and our upcoming meeting schedule. If anybody is interested in attending any of the NOWG meetings our e-mail addresses are on the bottom and they can contact any of the tri-

chairs and we'd be more than happy to send you invites and get you all the information you need to participate.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Thank you very much, good report.

Item 11 - Status of Industry Numbering Committee, the INC. And we did get the Xerox. We want to thank the FCC.

MALE SPEAKER: It was actually the next one that the FCC was kind enough to Xerox so we do thank them.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We thank them for doing this.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC)

ACTIVITIES

MR. NEWMAN: I'm Adam Newman from Telcordia Technologies. I'm the current ATIS Industry Numbering Committee Chairman and I wrote up a whole little thing on our mission for the kids but they've left.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's all right you can share it with us.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. NEWMAN: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We have some new members (unintelligible) so go ahead.

MR. NEWMAN: I suppose I can. My report is 27 slides though. Natalie McNamer who was just up here is the NOWG co-chair and is the vice chair of INC as well.

Your first page is just that we held several meetings face-to-face since the last

NANC meeting and our next meeting is December 6th through 10th and it's a virtual meeting. All information can be found with the link and the report on the ATIS INC website. For any new NANC members that don't have access they can request access through the contact information on the INC website.

In our former CO/NXX subcommittee, let me address that first. So INC recently reorganized its subcommittees. We went from having five to six depending on how you count dormant subcommittees to three subcommittees recently.

So the two that were most -- there were three that were often reported on here at NANC and they were the CO/NXX subcommittee which is responsible for the central office code assignment guidelines among others, the LNPA subcommittee which was responsible for the Thousands-Block Pooling Administrative Guidelines, and the NPA subcommittee Numbering and Plan area subcommittee which was responsible for the new NPAs, allocation relief, planning, et cetera. And then there were several other subcommittees of the INC.

We have consolidated to the resource assignment and management subcommittee so you're seeing it as the RAM subcommittee and the Numbering Addressing Resource Planning committee, the NARP subcommittee.

So just so you don't get confused because halfway through the deck we'll change subcommittee names because some issues closed under their old subcommittees and some issues closed under the new ones.

This came up last time. We were told last time by Mr. Gray that the INC was going to receive some correspondence with some issues of concerns to states.

So since the last NANC meeting INC did receive correspondence from a group of states submitted by Mr. Gray and from the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission and we numbered them GS-655 and GS-658.

We had several successful meetings with active in-person participation and via conference crew's participation with a number of state commission staff. Some of the concerns that were raised in this correspondence we can address and are addressing through new issues that I'll talk about as we go through the presentation. Others were beyond INC's purview.

The next couple of slides I'm actually going to layout what the issues were, how INC is addressing them if they can, and how we're punting on them if we can't, and then we'll go into some of the issues.

So we're addressing the following concerns, state review of applications during administrator processing timeframes. So one of the concerns that was brought to us by states was they weren't having enough time to review the applications before the assignments were made and in that correspondence it stated that INC had changed its timeframe for the administrators to process a Thousands-Block application.

So we noted that we did not change the timeframe for processing a Thousands-Block application. We've reported previously to NANC on an issue that actually reduced the timeframe for the CO code application but not for the Thousands-Block application and so we pointed that out to them and noted that most of their concerns were actually about Thousands-Block application because that's

what they review primarily.

We also introduced issue 698 to auto populate the total numbering resources on a Thousands-Block pooling assignment guidelines months to exhaust worksheet. As we discussed with the states, it was actually really beneficial having them in the room because we could say, okay, what are you trying to review, what's really the issue for you in reviewing the applications.

One of the things that they were verifying was the total resources that were assigned to a service provider on an application that gets reported in the MTE calculation. So INC introduced an issue to look at auto populating that information from a standard resource, from the NANPA and Pooling Administrator data. And that issue is still being worked. There are some complications to it and we'll report out on that when we finish our work in that issue in more detail.

Issue 693, we opened and subsequently closed and I'll talk about it in more detail. We have a slide on this issue to have a service provider periodically review its inventory to maintain no more than a six month supply of resources in any given rate area.

And Issue 697, to discuss voluntary code transfers for LRN purposes where feasible.

The second large issue that was address to INC by the states was OCN use as a result of merger and acquisitions. We did open an issue 691 with regard to questing a XXs and Thousands-Block after a merger of acquisition. I do have a slide on that issue, item three, volume of codes assigned for LRN purposes.

So clearly and I think as we heard earlier today on call with either the NANPA or the PA report or both, states were having some concerns as to the sheer volume of LRNs that were being assigned. I already noted that we have opened Issue 697 to detail in the guidelines a little more, the idea of voluntary code transfers for LRN purposes and I will talk about that issue in a moment.

Four, there were some concerns with codes assigned for dedicated customers so we have three issues opened as a result, Issue 632, update to the dedicated code section of both the Thousands-Block guidelines and the central office code guidelines.

Issue 685, which is evidence of a dedicated customer for code assignment in a pooling environment, and Issue 693 which I already mentioned, the review of inventory every six months. So I'll actually report out on each of those issues separately.

Issue 5, they had questions with regard to in-service versus activation and actually what qualifies. When we actually talked to them about what the concern was it was really about what some service providers were using to confirm an XX code or a Thousands-Block was in service which is the part four form.

So we opened Issue 696 to clarify the definition of in-service in the guidelines and we've added some language to both guidelines and the forms and I'll talk about those additions shortly.

Issue 6, the ability of an SP to adjust their forecasts when the application is submitted. We mostly resolved this through a conversation between the INC and the

state participants noting why it's necessary in the system for a service provider to have the ability to adjust its forecast on essentially an immediate basis.

An example of this is if a service provider has forecasted a need for a block in October but they don't apply for that block until November 1st, they need to be able to update the systems reflecting that the need is in November rather than October. It's a fairly straightforward example of why a forecast needs to be -- ability to update it.

And then there's always -- you know they get a large customer that they didn't expect to get and they want to be able to serve that customer and the service providers have a need to update the forecast for that.

The states did recognize that they do have the ability in their review period that if they see a forecast change unexpectedly that they have the ability to work with that service provider and contact that service provider and address their concerns.

Issue 7, allocation of resources to SPs without an NRUF on file. There's already a rule in place and procedures in place for resources not to be assigned to a service provider that has an NRUF on file.

Apparently there was a one time issue with one application that slipped through in a gap of timing but as a result NANPA has developed an enhancement that will go in with November 2010 to systematically prevent any such resource assignments to the SP that does not have a complete NRUF on file. So this will insure that it doesn't happen period, on a going forward basis.

And then Issue 8, reclamation, INC issued a (unintelligible) so there were

concerns with the workings of reclamations, the ability to reclaim resources that weren't being used properly and we opened two issues that we think help address these concerns.

And that's the review of inventory that I already discussed that has to go on, on a regular basis and then the clarification of in-service and the clarification of the part four form which makes it clearer what you can and not declare and not use to declare in-service whenever declaring a code, a block in-service.

There were a couple of big issues that INC was not able to address. They're not guideline issues. They are not process issues within our purview.

One of the concerns was the ability to get block donations from a service provider in a single service provider rate center when a second service provider entered that rate center and INC simply notes that there's an FCC order in this matter. It's FCC 03126 and the FCC specifically exempts a single service provider in a rate center until a second service provider has entered that rate center.

And states may be able to, and we understand that there are some difficulties in this from some states and maybe from more than some states, but they be able to work with that service provider to get donations in time for that new service provider and (unintelligible) to get blocks instead of codes, but given the way the order is written there's certainly nothing INC can do in the guidelines to facilitate that process.

And then reporting of intermediate numbers, there continues to be some according to the correspondence, no discussion with states, some frustration with

how intermediate numbers are reported on from an NRUF perspective. This is an issue that has come to NANC before.

The definition of intermediate numbers is in the FCC's order and in January 2003 we note that the NANC itself did send a report and requested the FCC to establish a rule making proceeding to clarify intermediate numbers.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That hasn't been done?

MR. NEWMAN: It has not. And there was one other relatively big idea that INC can address and INC was asked to consider changing LRNs from six digit based routing NPANXX based routing to seven digit based routing NPANXX-X based routing and INC notes that the LRN architecture itself was chosen to support six digit routing and changes to the basis of six digit routing would affect essentially every point on the PSTN and are clearly out of the scope of the INC and would likely require at least upgrades to every switch in the network.

And we do have a note on here and we sincerely mean it, we really do thank the state commission staff members who came to INC, or called in to INC and worked with us in the development of these issues.

We think it's really productive both for us and hopefully for the commission staff who worked with us to enhance the processes and each others understanding of both the guidelines and how they work in real life for all parties. We do thank them for their participation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And we thank you for doing that. That's very helpful.

MR. NEWMAN: Okay, the issues. Issue 632 updates the dedicated code

section of both the Thousands-Block guidelines and the Central Office Code guidelines.

Really what this comes down to is there wasn't a whole lot of detail in the guidelines as to how this process got done. We added language to the guidelines detailing the steps needed to return blocks to the pool from what was previously a dedicated code because it's no longer to be a dedicated code so that those blocks can be assigned.

So the presumption is in the issue that you had a customer who's a dedicated customer. That customer thought they were going to need approximately 10,000 numbers. You got a dedicated code for that customer. Well, after a couple of years they moved their offices somewhere else and now they're only using 2,000 numbers of the 10,000 numbers.

We didn't detail in the guidelines how you put those 8,000 numbers, those eight blocks back into the pool and undedicated the code and pool that code, and we added details in the guidelines as to how to do this as a result of one of the questions that was brought up by the states.

In addition, Issue 685, evidence of dedicated code for dedicated customer CO code assignment in a pooling environment, previously there was no requirement for service providers to provide specific documentation from a customer for that request of a dedicated code so such a requirement was added to the guidelines that an SP shall provide on its customer's letterhead documentation of the need for 10,000 consecutive telephone numbers.

Issue 697, voluntary code transfers for LRN purposes when feasible. As I mentioned earlier, there's significant concerns at the state level of the quantity of new codes being assigned to LRNs. We did add text to the COCAG and TBPAG to encourage that service provider that needs to be the code holder of a NXX for LRN purposes to investigate the possibility and feasibility of getting that code from another service provider in an alternative to opening a new NXX code.

The guidelines do note that there may be some issues with such a transfer from a technical and actually service perspective to the customers of the service provider that already has the code and the guidelines don't and can't really obligate the current code holder to transfer the code but we do encourage service providers in the guidelines to do it where feasible, to try conserving some of those codes.

Issue 693, service providers periodic review of inventory to maintain a six month supply. The federal rule requires that all service providers maintain no more than a six month inventory so there were concerns raised by state staff that some SPs may not be reviewing their inventory frequently enough.

So we added text to both the central code office guidelines and the Thousands-Block guidelines to require SPs to review their inventory semi-annually at a minimum. And we tied as I recall to the process for getting ready to (unintelligible) NRUF semi-annually, although I don't think we were particular on the dates.

We also reiterated that an SP shall donate a return, any eligible blocks ten percent or less contaminated that are not needed for that six month inventory on a

rate center basis.

Issue 691, requesting NXXs and Thousands-Blocks after a merger or acquisition. Some state commission staff were concerned with service providers retaining and using a non-surviving carrier's company code/OCNs when requesting resources after a merger or acquisition.

Our guidelines haven't previously addressed OCNs on applications after a service provider merges. We did add text to guidelines to outline the process for changing the OCN associated with (unintelligible) resources and added guidelines in the event that carrier opts to change the company name associated with the company code or OCN.

The industry standard for assignment and management of company code or OCNs isn't an INC standard. It's actually an ATIS TMOX NANC, allows the acquiring company to retain the non-surviving company codes at its option and use of combined entity codes is also optional within that standard so we don't maintain that standard.

We did note and sort of provide states with information as to what that standard is and I think ATIS was working to get a copy of at least the relevant section of those standards to the commission staff that was interested in participated. So we did what we could from an INC perspective to add sort directional and encourage guidelines language.

Issue 696, clarifying the definition of in-service. Some state staff were concerned that some service providers don't understand that administrative numbers

do not satisfy the in-service requirement and therefore were returning part four that the block or a code was in-service based on something other than an assigned number.

We did modify the definition of in-service in our guidelines and added clarification on the part four in-service form themselves to assist service providers in understanding that only assigned numbers to end users satisfy the in-service requirement.

And I quote the new definition on the slide. I'm not going to read it for you. The key is at the end. We added a sentence that really talks to the actual categories of numbers as defined by the FCC there.

And we added it to the form itself because we recognize that maybe not everybody who is applying for numbers and using the form actually goes and reads the guidelines, nonetheless the glossary definition in the guidelines. They should. So we made sure this was on the form itself.

Issue 692, update the PCS5YY requirements for resources. As noted during the NANPA report, the demand for 5YY numbers has increased substantially over the past few years. I think we reported on implementation of the 533 NPA for PCS services, (unintelligible) nine and it's anticipated the NANPA will introduce 544 by the fourth quarter of 2010.

As a result INC accepted Issue 692 to have an entire sort of re-look at the PCS 5YY and XX code assignment guidelines to insure that NANPA and applicants have a clear understanding of the criteria necessary to obtain the numbers and we

recognize that the use of these numbers is evolving with technology and we're working to update the service description for these resources in another issue, Issue 702, which we'll likely report on when we get further along that issue. That issue was just introduced at the last (unintelligible).

Issue 664, review NPA allocation guidelines to consider NPA sharing. I reported I just don't remember how long ago now, that on the entrance of (unintelligible) into the NANP and when we were investigating the technical feasibility of (unintelligible) entrance into the NANP feedback was received from a number of NANP members that INC should consider NPA sharing among new NANP entrance to conserve NANP resources.

As a result we accepted Issue 664 in October of 2009, to investigate the potential impacts of providing for the sharing of NPAs among NANP members. We performed an investigation to determine the technical billing, international settlement and other operational impacts of sharing an area code between two or more countries and have noted that significant work would be required to allow such sharing of an NPA between more than one country.

We did not specifically provide a recommendation that NPA sharing should be considered going forward in the guidelines but we did make extensive revisions to the criteria for applications to the NANP including potential recommendations for applicants seeking to join the NANP that may include (unintelligible) conditions regarding the use of NANP resources by an applicant country that foster efficient and effective use of NANP resources including but not limited to NPA and CO code

management and conservation measures and potential NPA code sharing by countries or parts of countries or a territory belonging to that country.

So we did significant revisions to the guidelines to foster good resource management with new NANP entrance and to allow for the possibility of it in the future should it be feasible.

Issue 676, for review of sections 6.2 of the NPA allocation guidelines. Section 6.2 includes the requirement for NANPA to publish semi-annual NANP exhaust projections and to advise the INC and national regulatory authorities of NANP countries when the NANPA's forecast is set to exhaust within a 15 year timeframe.

In our review of the NPA allocation plan and assignment guidelines, one of the things we did include with this issue was update the guidelines where they were a little outdated.

So this is a place where we updated the guidelines to reflect the INC recommended expansion plan to the North American Numbering Plan which was presented to the NANC in 2001 by one of my predecessors, Dana or Ken, I can't remember which one did it, and since we revised this we wanted to remind the NANC of the 15 year period.

That includes five years for NANP wide EVP of limitation, uniform dialing plan implementation in ten years for NANP expansion implementation itself. The recommended plan is published at the INC website and we've included information for those who are curious. And I'm glad to answer any questions about that

(unintelligible).

We have two issues that are in initial pending. One is Issue 534 that I reported on fairly extensively. I did an update at the last NANC on this issue and if you'll remember Madam Chairwoman, you were going to contact the FCC to see about the status of the final pANIs.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you for reminding me.

MR. NEWMAN: I figured that was my job to remind you.

And Issue 611, augmenting the NRUF verification procedures, both the NANPA and the PA reported on this. There's a change order, in NANPA's case it's change order 18 that will take this out of initial pending and into final when it is implemented.

And then you have six issues in initial closure and four pages of issues that we've put in final closure since the last meeting. I am not going to read all those to you. If you look them over and you have a question about any particular issue on that list, I'm delighted to answer said question either now or offline.

And that should conclude my report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Questions?

MS. TIFFANY: Sue Tiffany, Sprint-Nextel. On your Issue 691, requesting a NXX after a merger acquisition and in particular the OCNs, Adam, do you know how service providers are notified or if they're notified when OCNs are returned?

MR. NEWMAN: I don't know if there's specific notification that goes

out when an OCN is returned to NECA, well, a company code is returned to NECA. I know that NECA provides a database product with up-to-date company code information that Telcordia Technologies also reflects in its LERG Routing Guide and so that would no longer appear in the company code list one would presume or would appear as returned.

I'd have to go looking. I haven't seen one in that status in my memory but it doesn't mean it hasn't occurred but I know of no like e-mail notification that goes out.

MS. TIFFANY: But there is a database where you can go look?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes.

MS. TIFFANY: The reason I ask is because some carriers keep track of OCNs from their trading partners, their porting trading partners.

MR. NEWMAN: Understood. So the list of OCNs is available. NECA is the manager of the company code resource. Their website if I recall is www.necca.org. There is a company code tab off there somewhere. In addition that data is reflected in LERG volume one.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Next question.

MR. HEPBURN: Hi. My name is Christopher Hepburn with Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. I have a few issues I'd like to discuss here.

First I'd like to clarify on page six number six, where it says about the service provider being able to adjust forecasts.

The main reason that Pennsylvania and many of the other states that were at

the INC meeting were concerned was because we've seen a pattern of some, not all carriers, some going in and changing their forecasts, opening a pool replenishment code, getting maybe a block even though there are blocks available in that rate center, then reducing their forecast back down to where it was to begin with so they could get a clean code and block. Why that is nobody seems to want to tell the commission why they're doing this.

MR. NEWMAN: So I do remember that discussion now Chris, and I think we also discussed that we thought about it and we talked about, some of us sort of raised eyebrows around the table and said wow, that's a neat idea, we never thought of it.

And we have some concerns about adding guidelines into the language in that regard in part because it would almost, you know, I don't want to say hacker manual but you start by writing guidelines text about -- we have concerns and I think the states sort of echo the concern to some extent that if we start writing about it in our guidelines people will be tempted to do it, but it's really just conversation at this point.

MR. HEPBURN: Right, and Pennsylvania would like to note that the three area code exhaust that Pennsylvania is going through currently is partly because of this practice, in fact 570 was put in jeopardy because of this practice so we want to make sure that's noted.

The second issue I'd like to discuss is the OCN issue after the merger and acquisition. What we are seeing, and the reason that we brought this to INC in the

first place was that carriers are going in and circumventing the FCC's utilization by using these multiple OCNs and getting numbers perhaps when they should not be getting numbers based on utilization.

What we would like to see happen and we note that NECCA does have a combined entity code for this but like Adam said, it is voluntary and currently it only depicts what OCNs are associated with what companies in the database only.

The state commissions would like to perhaps see NANC go a little bit further and see if there is a way that we could perhaps require them to get this combined entity code so that they could start combining resources in the MTE form that they cannot circumvent the FCC rules.

The third one, when it comes to the intermediate numbers, Pennsylvania specifically would like to request that NANC coax the FCC a little bit and see if they could do something with the filing that NANC filed --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Seven years ago.

MR. HEPBURN: Seven years ago. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Any other comments or questions on the report. Thank you very much for the report. We do appreciate your working with the states and I assume it is process that will continue? Sorry, Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission.

I think just a comment on the merger acquisition multiple OCN issue that Pennsylvania has raised. For those who haven't experienced or ever been involved in it, the issue comes down to a carrier, whether they intentionally do it or just the

group that's responsible for getting the numbers is associated with a particular entity uses that OCN.

You look at their utilization if there's any questions from a state perspective and you say okay, they meet all the criteria when in fact if you took all of the operating companies in your jurisdiction and aggregated their resources together of similar modalities, in fact they may not qualify for assignment.

So I think in terms of the numbering resource utilization and being good stewards of those resources, I don't know if there's anything we can do to foster the need for a combined (unintelligible) OCN that at least you would know who are the players on the street and with that one OCN you can then backtrack to find out who all the companies are that are involved in that because more and more with all the mergers and acquisitions it becomes real difficult to sort out the family tree anymore.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think states are also finding out as we go through that mapping process for the internet service providers, the same thing is happening, that there's multiple, multiple mergers, acquisitions, changes of names that are still listed and don't necessarily exist in that same form and that impacts numbering resources too obviously.

Okay, thank you very much for continuing your work with the states among other things.

And our final, Future of Numbering Working Group.

And we did get that report printed, thank you. Thank you Marilyn, thank you. Our tax dollars at work. Okay, Don.

REPORT OF THE FUTURE OF NUMBERING WORKING GROUP (FoN WG)

MR. GRAY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission and one of the tri-chairs for the Future of Numbering Working Group. I'll try to keep this short.

If you'll remember the last meeting, one of our members asked for some additional time to review the white paper, give it further consideration. And we subsequently contacted them. There was no substantive edits or changes that they saw on the paper.

So we're now on to page three, I won't go through all of that because it's a summary of what the Future of Numbering Working Group believes the paper contained. It wasn't a position paper on what's right, what's wrong, but a position paper on this is what is currently happening in the industry, here are the current rules and regulations that are in the industry, and perhaps some ideas on what else could be done.

And so, on page four, the Future of Numbering Working Group would bring a recommendation to the NANC that we be allowed to distribute this white paper to a broader segment outside the NANC, specifically some of the stakeholders within the toll free environment. SNAC, the committee under ATIS, SMS 800 management teams, the toll free industry has given us some specific entities that they would

recommend.

Circulate the paper to them, get feedback from them and then the FoN could incorporate that feedback back into the white paper and then bring it back to the NANC for consideration as to further disposition, as to whether it's a good exercise to establish what is going on in the toll free environment, what the current practices are, issues that may arise because of those practices, or perhaps take a few steps further with specific recommendations for changes in the rules and regulations as to how toll free numbers are allocated, signed, and managed.

So with this I would ask for the discussion and consideration of that request.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The request is whether the NANC wants to authorize the distribution of the white paper to a broader group. Any discussion on that? Is there any opposition to that? Fine, thank you. That will be done.

Then the second is identify the points you made in the cover letter, who will collaborate to prepare the cover letter for NANC's approval post meeting via e-mail. I'm sure the cover letter could come from the Chairman of NANC, I assume distributing it to those groups that you identified, that the committee has identified. I assume the letter will simply say this is an important issue we would like your input on.

If you feel you have to see that letter before I sign it let me know otherwise I will send out a letter, prepare a cover letter that says that general thing and it would be nice if we could ask them to give us some input back in time for a report at the December meeting. Okay, good, thank you.

MR. GRAY: And that is all I have Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, excellent. Thank you.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, we do have on the agenda a summary of action items. I know one action item is we are going to send out the Future of Numbering and the toll free.

And pANI, yes, and I will follow up again on the pANI and on the intermediate numbers and poke the FCC on that. Yes.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) Natalie McNamer of T-Mobile. Just as a reminder on the intermediate numbers, I think in our October or November meeting last year the NOWG was able to research and find those documents from 2003 and we did submit that to the NANC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and we appreciate that. So we have that.

Public comments and participation, to ask members of the public who have something to say about each issue to come up. Is there anyone who has something on their minds that they want to say? Anything? Okay.

If there is no other business aside from a reminder that our next meeting is scheduled -- I'm sorry, Don has other business. Go ahead.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. Really going to transition right into what you were about to talk about and that is meeting dates.

Thursday is a traditional meeting date for FCC I think to meet so if they

decide to have a meeting we get ousted. We may not use ousted. We are asked to transition to another date.

I'm wondering if going forward for future dates if maybe picking some other day of the week like a Tuesday so you can travel on Monday, meet on Tuesday and either return home or have other meetings in town. If that's appropriate maybe we could consider that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think that is a good suggestion because that has happened twice. This is their hearing room and if they decide to have a meeting and they do meet on Thursdays starting at 10:00 a.m.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 16th. As a precaution do you want to move it to Tuesday, December 14th? Would that be good? Okay, and then I will send out a proposed schedule for 2011 and we'll look at Tuesdays quarterly.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) but they are scheduled for Wednesday meeting, December 15th.

CHAIRMAN KANE: December 15th, yes.

MALE SPEAKER: They've already scheduled their meeting and it starts the 15th.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Want to leave it on the 16th then? All right we'll leave it on December 16th but then I will send out a schedule for 2011 which has it on a Tuesday because sometimes they meet on Wednesdays and sometimes on Thursdays but, I have not known the FCC to meet on a Tuesday so far.

Okay, thank you all very much for enduring without a lunch break. I don't know what it's called. You know, breakfast and lunch is brunch. I don't know what lunch and dinner is but go out and have it and happy weekend. Thank you all very, very much for all your input and all your work.

(Meeting Adjourned)

(END OF AUDIO CD)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF AGENCY

I, Carol J. Schwartz, President of Carol J. Thomas Stenotype Reporting Services, Inc., do hereby certify we were authorized to transcribe the submitted audio CD, and that thereafter these proceedings were transcribed under our supervision, and I further certify that the forgoing transcription contains a full, true and correct transcription of the audio CD furnished, to the best of our ability.

CAROL J. SCHWARTZ

PRESIDENT

ON THIS DATE OF:
